

DESK

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 12 1956

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

# modern

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

# language

VOL. LXXI, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1956

# notes

- 79 Bjólfur and Grendill in Iceland. STEFÁN EINARSSON
- 82 *Vox Clamantis*, IV, 12. ROBERT R. RAYMO
- 84 Relationship between the *Physician's Tale* and the *Parson's Tale*.  
C. A. OWEN, JR.
- 87 The Irene Story and Dr. Johnson's Sources. BERNA MORAN
- 91 An Unattributed Story by Katherine Mansfield? J. GARLINGTON
- 93 Who is Betty Byrne? JULIAN B. KAYE
- 96 A Possible Source of the "Circe" Chapter of Joyce's *Ulysses*.  
J. KORG
- 98 *The Red Badge of Courage* and a Review of Zola's *La Débâcle*.  
J. B. COLVERT
- 100 Pierre de Beauvais' *Lacovie*. FLORENCE MCCULLOCH
- 101 Note sur l'épithaphe de Rabelais par Ronsard. MARCEL FRANÇON
- 103 Pascal et l'édition des *Pensées*. J.-J. DEMOREST
- 105 Musset, de Quincey, and Piranesi. P. F. JAMIESON
- 109 A Note on the *Comedia Serafina* and *El Conde Alarcos*.  
T. PICKERING
- 114 Galdos' *La de los tristes destinos* and Its Shakespearian Con-  
nections. W. H. SHOEMAKER
- 119 Friedrich Schlegel's *Alarcos* in the Light of His Unpublished  
Notebooks. HANS EICHNER

## REVIEWS

- 122 W. P. ALBRECHT, *The Loathly Lady in Thomas of Erceldoune* (T. A. KIRBY)
- 124 E. V. GORDON, ed., *Pearl* (H. L. SAVAGE)
- 129 W. B. EWALD, *The Masks of Jonathan Swift* (H. D. KELLING)
- 131 J. L. CLIFFORD, *Young Sam Johnson* (J. H. HAGSTRUM)
- 134 C. N. COE, *Wordsworth and the Literature of Travel* (G. DUNKLIN)
- 134 G. TILLOTSON, *Thackeray the Novelist* (E. F. SHANNON, JR.)
- 136 C. H. CANTRELL and W. R. PATRICK, comp., *Southern Literary Culture: a Bibliography of Masters' and Doctors' Theses* (C. R. ANDERSON)
- 138 S. M. VOGEL, *German Literary Influences on the American Transcendentalists* (H. A. POCHMANN)
- 141 H. C. HORSFORD, ed., *Journal of a Visit to Europe and the Levant, by Herman Melville* (C. R. ANDERSON)
- 142 W. V. O'CONNOR, *The Tangled Fire of William Faulkner* (C. R. ANDERSON)
- 146 HERMANN FLASDIECK, "Pall Mall," *Beiträge zur Etymologie und Quantitätstheorie* (N. E. ELIASON)
- 148 E. HOEFFNER, *Les Troubadours dans leur vie et dans leurs œuvres* (GRACE FRANK)
- 148 N. C. CARPENTER, *Rabelais and Music* (MARCEL FRANÇON)
- 151 F. P. ELLISON, *Brazil's New Novel* (G. MOSER)
- 154 D. L. CLARK, ed., *Shelley's Prose* (E. R. WASSERMAN)
- 156 F. VIAL, *Voltaire, sa vie et son œuvre* (C. CHERPACK)

---

## modern language notes

KEMP MALONE,  
General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

STEFAN EINARSSON

ANNA HATCHER

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN

J. HILLIS MILLER

GEORGES POULET

EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md., Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

graphy

ville

neorie

(NK)

through

: \$6.25

, \$1.00.

should

8, Md.

scripts

s, The

Every

return

ers are

, Md.,

ate of

ngress,

1  
1  
1

B

the  
ele  
ou  
of  
M  
th  
mi  
me

be  
Bu  
di  
ea  
an  
th  
ne

(A  
of  
It  
Pu  
7 k  
an  
Gr

vor



# modern language notes

VOL. LXXI, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1956

## Bjölfur and Grendill in Iceland

Going to Iceland in the summer of 1954 to write a description of the East fjords for the Tourist Society of Iceland,<sup>1</sup> I had to make a close study of the place names of these districts. In fact, as it turned out, a good deal of my work consisted in making a thorough comparison of the place names as published on the great Danish General Staff Map of Iceland<sup>2</sup> and as they existed in the minds and memories of the present inhabitants of the districts, at home, whereby lots of mistakes were brought to light and perhaps other mistakes made by me and my informers.

I spent a month in Reykjavík to familiarize myself with the maps, before starting on my survey of the East, beginning in the South-East. But I had not looked long at a map of South East Iceland, before I discovered the name *Grendill* on a mountain peak, located near the eastern edge of the great glacier Vatnajökull, not very far from another mountain, also in the glacier, called *Goðaborg*, about which there are many folktales current, both in Hornafjörður and Lón, the nearest inhabited districts.

<sup>1</sup> Ferðafélag Íslands was established in 1927 and has published a year-book (*Árbók*) since 1928. These year-books are now the most detailed description of Iceland in existence. The year-book of 1955 was written by me last summer. It describes the southern part of the East from Alftafjörður to Reyðarfjörður.

<sup>2</sup> Uppdráttur Íslands. Aðalkort Bl. 8. Miðasturland. Scale: 1: 250 000. Published by the Geodetic Institut. Copenhagen, 1946.—*Grendill* is about 7 km below (south of) latitude 64 and a little east of midway between 15 and 16 longitude west of Greenwich. *Goðaborg* is midway between the two, *Grendill* northeast of it.

This discovery elated me a great deal, and I said to myself: Here we have in the East of Iceland both *Beowulf* and *Grendel*, both names probably equally old, though only the first has been known to scholars for a long time. The tradition of the mountain *Bjölfur* is as old and well established as a tradition can be in Iceland, since the name is nothing but the personal name of the first settler in Seyðisfjörður, called *Bjólfr* in *Landnámabók*. The mountain rises just above his old farm. That personal names serve as mountain names in Iceland is not really very common, but there are not a few instances, both in the East and elsewhere. Thus a mountain in Loðmundarfjörður, next fjord to the north of Seyðisfjörður, is called *Gunnhildur*; late folktales claim that she was a settler of that fjord. But *Loðmundr*, who settled in Loðmundarfjörður according to *Landnámabók*, gave his name not only to that beautiful fjord, but also presumably much later to an impressive mountain, *Loðmundur*, in the highlands of the South, far above and far inland from the surfbound shore, where he ultimately settled at Sólheimar. These mountains, in spite of the personal names, do not look like persons, but there are peaks of that type, like *Örnólfur* between Fáskrúðsfjörður and *Lolli* in Norðfjörður.

As to *Grendill*, supposing that it was based on old tradition, I assumed that it would probably be a giants name. I do not know too many male giant names in place names in Iceland. The magician Loðmundur might have been considered a giant, the peak *Lolli* looks like one, and there is a similar giant-like peak in Breiðdalur, called *Röndólfur*, a name borrowed from a troll-giant in *Göngu-Hrólfs saga*. But names of giantesses are used as mountain names, so for instance *Skessa* in Reyðarfjörður of the East, and the famous volcano names *Hekla*, *Katla*, and *Enta*. (*Hekla* erupted in 1947, *Katla* in 1918 for the last time). There is a folk tale about the troll-woman *Katla*, a criminal who finally leaped into the chasm of the mountain, causing eruption of the volcano. *Enta*, name of a volcanic chasm, quite isolated in the language, is the Icelandic counterpart to Old English *ent* "giant," familiar from *Beowulf's eald enta geweorc*—as I demonstrated in a note in this periodical a few years ago.

So, if *Grendill* was an old place name in Iceland it would be in good company of giants' names, there would be little doubt of its meaning and its ultimate identity with *Beowulf's* monster, *Grendel*.

But alas and alack! My inquiries, first in Reykjavik and then as near the spot as possible, that is in Hornafjörður, Lón, and Álftafjörður all lead to nothing: nobody knew the place name. There

seemed to be no way around the conclusion that it was a modern place name, probably given by the man who surveyed the place, before the Danish map was made, the astronomer, mathematician, and surveyor Steinþór Sigurðsson (born 1904, killed near the erupting Hekla in 1947). He had surveyed the highlands of the East for the Danish map-makers during the years 1930-38. His colleague and collaborator Ágúst Böðvarsson could give me his work-sheet with two stereo-photographs<sup>3</sup> on which he had written *Grendill* in his neat clear hand (though rather faint, because made by a leadpencil). But no amount of inquiry could carry me beyond that point. There was one more tantalizing complication. While surveying in these parts, Steinþór Sigurðsson had, to some extent, enjoyed the expert guidance of the farmer at Bragðavellir in Álftafjörður, Jón Sigfússon. It was this farmer who found the two Roman coins on his farm, one minted by Probus Cæsar (276-82) the other by Aurelianus Cæsar (270-75) on which archeologists and historians have now formulated a theory that a Roman fleet got to Iceland shortly after 300 A. D.<sup>4</sup> But this farmer, too, had died when I visited his farm. He was survived by two deaf and dumb sons, who, in spite of their handicap, had built a very beautiful *túngarður* (fence) around their farm. But the secret of *Grendill*, if any, was obviously well kept in that family.

The peculiar thing about *Grendill* as a modern Icelandic place name is the fact that it seems to be unique and not easily explained from the native resources of the language. There is no such word in the language according to the Old and Modern Icelandic dictionaries (Fritzner, Cleasby-Vigfússon, Blöndal). Nearest comes a name *grindill*, "wind, storm," listed by Finnur Jónsson in his *Lexicon Poeticum antiquae linguae septentrionalis*, taken by him from *pulur* (Lists, thulas, catalogues) of the *Snorra Edda*.

It has been suggested that *Grendill* was perhaps a corrupted form for *Grindill*, because in the East the local dialect speakers confuse *e* and *i* (due to a sound change *i* to *e*). This is true, but only when the vowel is long (as in *Tytja* pronounced *Tetja*). The vowels in *Grendill-Grindill* are short and would not at all be confused, when spoken. So Steinþór Sigurðsson could have heard only one form of

<sup>3</sup> One of these photographs is actually printed in *Arbók Ferðafélags Íslands*, 1937, p. 73, the lower photo on the page. The peak *Grendill* is not marked on the picture, but it is 6.2 mm from the right edge of the picture.

<sup>4</sup> "Rómverjar á Íslandi" in Kristján Eldjárn, *Gengið á reka*. Reykjavík, 1948.

these names in the East. But it is true that an Easterner, confusing the two long vowels, might easily also have confused the two short ones in *writing*. So there is a remote chance that Steindór found the name in a local document, intending to write *Grindill*, but spelling it wrongly *Grendill*.

The upshot of this investigation is that it remains much harder to explain the name if modern, than if it were old. It would even be easier to surmise that Steinþór had read *Beowulf* and lifted the name bodily therefrom. His friends could not tell me, but they were very sceptical of that theory, so I would not dare to advance it in earnest. And that is as far as we can go for the time being.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

STEFAN EINARSSON

### *Vox Clamantis*, IV, 12

In the fourth book of his comprehensive satire on contemporary society, the *Vox Clamantis*, John Gower considers the abuses of the regular clergy, charging them with gross neglect of their vows and abysmal surrender to worldly lusts.<sup>1</sup> Following a familiar practice of medieval satirists, he digresses briefly from his censure of monastic corruption to admonish the good monk for the sake of his soul's salvation to preserve his traditionally simple, though hard and austere, way of life.<sup>2</sup> Commonplace as these admonitions are in the moral and religious literature of the Middle Ages, they embody, on Gower's part, a characteristic plagiarism from an anonymous collection of penitential verses which, dating from the early thirteenth century, enjoyed a widespread popularity in Western Europe for over two hundred years, a popularity, we may add, out of all proportion to their artistic excellence.<sup>3</sup> The evidence of plagiarism supplied by the two

<sup>1</sup> John Gower, *Vox Clamantis*, in *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay, iv, Oxford, 1902, pp. 166-200.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, iv, 12, pp. 180-81, ll. 491-546. Quoted below are ll. 495-506, 511-14.

<sup>3</sup> The text of the poem printed below is from the edition of B. Hauréau, *Notices et Extraits de Quelques Manuscrits Latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, i, Paris, 1890, p. 374. Hauréau prints the text from BN MS. lat. 8433. Other copies may be found in BN MS. lat. 15952; Vienna, Nationalbibliothek MSS. 4012, 4015, 4031; Munich, Stadtsbibliothek MS. 9536; St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek MS. 933; Rome, Vatican MS. lat. 10807; Copenhagen, Royal Library MS. S. 3397; London, BM Royal MS. 13 A xiii; their number



## Relationship between the *Physician's Tale* and the *Parson's Tale*

As one of the subdivisions of Accidie, or Sloth, in the *Parson's Tale*, Chaucer takes up lachesse and almost immediately leaves the sources as presented by Miss Petersen (*The Sources of the Parson's Tale*, Boston 1901, p. 65) to give an example:

Thanne comth lachesse; that is he, that whan he beginneth any good werk, anon he shal forleten it and stynten; [as doon they that han any wight to governe, and ne taken of hym namoore kep, anon as they fynden any contrarie or any anoy. Thise been the newe shepherdes that leten hir sheep wityngly go renne to the wolf that is in the breres, or do no fors of hir owene governaunce.] Of this comth poverte and destruccioun, bothe of spiritueel and temporeel thynges. Thanne comth a manere cooldnesse, that freseth al the herte of a man. (I, 722)

Robinson in his note on the passage suggests that the newe shepherdes "may have been intended by Chaucer as a reference to the government being taken over by Gloucester in 1388." The poverty and destruction both of spiritual and temporal things pointed to as results of "lachesse" seem to demand a national stage for their fulfillment. Actually, however, as is clear from the ultimate Latin source (see Petersen, *ibid.*) and from other passages in the section on sloth (see 685, 706, 725), the reference here is to the man's own health of body and soul rather than to the effect of his "lachesse" on others. Sloth is set off from the three earlier sins discussed in that it brings not only spiritual death, but also the loss of "alle goodes temporeles." Though Chaucer in his interpolation glances for a moment at the effect on others and gives us the proverbial image in the sheep allowed to stray among wolves, he is returning with the words "Of this comth poverte" to the "sins" material. Furthermore, whatever Chaucer may have felt about Gloucester's "governaunce," he could hardly have thought of it as lax when its zeal for reform resulted in the death of friends and perhaps his own temporary retirement from public affairs.

The limits of Chaucer's interpolation (it begins with the words "as doon they" and ends with the image of the new shepherds), the emphasis on plural governors and a singular governed, and the image itself of shepherd, sheep and wolves, suggest a link with another passage and a more private interpretation. I am referring of course

to Chaucer's digression on governesses in the *Physician's Tale*, which concludes with the lines

Under a shepherde softe and necligent  
The wolf hath many a sheep and lamb torent. C 102

The digression in the *Physician's Tale* has long been taken to refer to Chaucer's sister-in-law, Katherine Swynford, and to the court scandal involving her charge, John of Gaunt's daughter Elizabeth, and John Holland. Chaucer attributed the scandal to the negligence of both governess and parents, as is apparent from such passages as

To teche hem vertu looke that ye ne slake C 82  
Now kepeth wel, for if ye wole, ye kan.  
Looke wel that ye unto no vice assente. . . . C 87

addressed to governesses; and

Youre is the charge of al hir surveiaunce C 95  
Beth war, that by ensauple of youre lyvyng,  
Or by youre necligence in chastisyng,  
That they ne perisse C 99

to the parents. The phrase "by ensauple of youre lyvyng" finds point in the liaison between Katherine and John of Gaunt and perhaps an echo in the *Parson's Tale's* "or do no fors of hir owene governaunce."

The reference in the *Parson's Tale* is both much shorter and much more general.<sup>1</sup> It seems likely also, if we are justified in assuming a connection between the two passages, to be the later. The digression on governesses in the *Physician's Tale* is surprising not only for its length but also for its inappropriateness. Only at a time close to the events that occasioned his evident moral indignation could Chaucer have felt this reference justified by the contrasting purity of Virginia, who

So kepte hirself hir neded no maistresse. C 106

The passage in the *Parson's Tale*, though still an interpolation, is in its proper place in the work and has a far lower emotional temperature. Two explanations are possible: Chaucer wrote the general considera-

<sup>1</sup> For instance the specific "lordes doghtres" of C 73 and 76 become the more general "any wight" and "hym" of I 720. Already in addressing the parents in the *Physician's Tale*, Chaucer had thought of the situation in general terms:

Ye fadres and ye moodres eek also C 94  
Though ye han children, be it oone or mo. . . .



tion of "gouvernaunce" in the *Parson's Tale* before the scandal involving his sister-in-law; after the scandal he wrote much more strongly on the subject, recalling some of the language and in particular the image of the sheep and wolves from the earlier treatment. Alternatively Chaucer first took up the subject under the immediate impact of the scandal, and later, when the meaning and language of the section on sloth brought the experience again to mind, treated the subject more calmly and in terms so generalized that without the parallels to the *Physician's Tale* we might fail to catch his meaning. Of the two explanations the second is much the more plausible. It explains both the interpolation in the *Parson's Tale*, difficult to account for if no personal experience motivated it, and the cryptic way in which the subject is there treated, the earlier passage having already established a meaning in Chaucer's mind for the terms which puzzle a casual reader of the *Parson's Tale*.

The *Parson's Tale* and the *Physician's Tale* are also related by St. Augustine's definition of envy as "sorwe of oother mennes wele, and joye of othere mennes harm." That this twofold description of envy was commonly attributed to St. Augustine we can see from fol. 143 v in Harley 7322 (Furnivall, *Political, Religious and Love Poems*, p. 257), where the Latin reads

De isto malo dicit Augustinus, quod est aliene felicitatis tristitia, et adversitatis leticia.

That it made a deep impression on Chaucer can be seen from its inclusion not only as a definition of envy in both *Physician's Tale* and *Parson's Tale* but also as a description of sloth in the latter, where he is discussing the interrelationships of envy, ire, and sloth:

Thanne is Accidie the angwissh of troubled herte; and Seint Augustyn seith, "It is anoy of goodnesse and Ioye of harm." 678

It would be natural to suppose that despite its general currency the quotation came to Chaucer from the source for the *Parson's Tale*, that in fact its presence in the *Physician's Tale* derives from a reading of the source if not from its actual translation as the *Parson's Tale*. But a closer inspection suggests another possibility. The ultimate source in Peraldus, as given by Miss Petersen (p. 46), reads as follows:

Invidia, secundum Aug., est dolor felicitatis aliene.

The *Parson's Tale*, on the other hand, begins its presentation of the second of the deadly sins,



After Pride wol I speken of the foule synne of Envye, which that is, as by the word of the philosopre, "sorwe of oother mannes prosperitee"; and after the word of Seint Augustyn, it is "sorwe of oother mennes wele, and joye of oother mennes harm." 484

The twofold definition, as being St. Augustine's, may have come to Chaucer from some other source and have been first used by him in the *Physician's Tale*. When Chaucer then came upon the shorter definition in the source of the *Parson's Tale*, he may have translated it faithfully and ascribed it to the indefinite and as yet undiscovered "philosopre," adding what he knew to be St. Augustine's fuller definition.<sup>2</sup>

The *Physician's Tale*, because of its reference to the court scandal and because of its stylistic resemblance to the *Legend of Good Women*, has invariably been dated among the earliest of the *Canterbury Tales*, i. e. circa 1388. If the relationships here postulated for the *Parson's Tale* are correct, then the translation of at least the "sins" section of that treatise would most logically come in the early years of the following decade, between the *Physician's Tale*, by which it was thrice influenced, and the *Pardoner's Prologue and Tale* and the *Merchant's Tale*, which it so clearly influenced.

University of Connecticut

CHARLES A. OWEN, JR.

## The Irene Story and Dr. Johnson's Sources

Of Dr. Johnson's works *Irene* is one which has attracted little attention from critics and scholars, probably because it is a dull play and "singularly deficient in allusions to be illustrated or difficulties to be explained."<sup>1</sup> As for the question of sources, there did not seem to be any from the earlier drama, for the first draft<sup>2</sup> of the play shows that Johnson had studied Knolles' *Historie of the Turkes* (1603) and had derived his story from this book, which he greatly

<sup>2</sup> Actually what has been assumed to be the source in Augustine gives the shorter definition: "Invidia est enim odium felicitatis alienae," Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. XXXVII, St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in psalmos lxxx-cl*, psalm CIV, 25,—1399.

<sup>1</sup> *The Poems of Samuel Johnson*, ed. Nichol Smith and E. L. McAdam (Oxford, 1941), p. 233.

<sup>2</sup> Edited for the first time together with the poems by Nichol Smith and E. L. McAdam; see *ibid.*, pp. 336 ff.

admired.<sup>3</sup> Therefore it has been taken for granted that the only source of *Irene* was Knolles, and all the other plays on the same subject previous to Johnson's have been too hastily brushed aside. Nichol Smith thinks it safe to assume that Johnson knew neither Gilbert Swinhoe's *The Tragedy of the Unhappy Fair Irene* (1658), nor the anonymous play *Irene, A Tragedy* (1664), and points out that Chales Goring's *Irene; or the Fair Greek* (1708) even if known to Johnson offered him nothing. The conclusion reached by Nichol Smith about the plays is that "none of them owes anything to another, nor did they provide anything to their great successor."<sup>4</sup> That Johnson took nothing from either Swinhoe or Goring is true, but the claim that he neither knew nor used the anonymous *Irena* (1664) cannot be accepted.

The story, which originated in Bandello's *Parte de le Novelle del Bandello* (1554), was a popular one, and in England it first appeared in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* (1556) and later on took its place in Knolles' *Historie*.<sup>5</sup> To understand how much Johnson owes to the anonymous *Irena* it is necessary to give here an outline of the story as found in Knolles.

Irene was a Greek girl captured at the fall of Constantinople, and presented to Sultan Mahomet II. He fell deeply in love with her, and from then onwards "the day he spent with her in discourse, and the night in dalliance" (Knolles, 350). He cared no more for his empire, the government of which he left to others, thus provoking the anger of his soldiers, who began to grumble and even talk of dethroning him. The great Bassas took alarm and one of them, Mustapha, spoke to the Sultan, and reminding him of his high duties begged him to control his passion for the Greek girl. Mahomet was torn between love and duty, but finally he made his choice; having assembled his Bassas he called in Irene, and to prove that "there is no earthly thing that can so much blind my senses . . . as not to see and understand my high place and calling" (Knolles, 353) suddenly cut off Irene's head in their presence.

<sup>3</sup> See *The Rambler*, No. 122.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 236-37. I mention only N. Smith because the "Introduction" to *Irene* in this volume is a reprint from a paper contributed by him to *Essays and Studies by the English Association*, xiv (1929). Though Lodowick Carlell's *Osmond the Great Turk* (1657), and the first two acts of Thomas Goffe's *The Covragious Turk, or Amurath the First* (1632) are based on the same Irene story, these plays are not mentioned by N. Smith.

<sup>5</sup> In England the historical truth of the story was, I think, for the first time questioned by Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chap. LXVIII.

It is true that the unknown writer of *Irena* (1664) and Johnson interpret this material rather differently. For the latter it was a suitable subject for a moral lesson to show that guilty ambition is punished and that "none are great, or happy, but the Virtuous," whereas in the earlier play, although there is a similar moral lesson, there is no guilty Irena, Mahomet is a noble figure, and the play has a happy ending. But despite these differences of approach to the theme, it is, I think, obvious that Johnson made use of the 1664 play in constructing and elaborating his plot. For in both plays we find the same subplot added to, or rather, worked into the story as told by Knolles.

The anonymous writer of the earlier play altered the original story by bringing in new characters and by inventing an intrigue. To begin with, apart from the Irene of the original story there is another captive Greek girl, Perinthia (attending on Irena), and there are two Greek noblemen, Honorius and Justinianus (in love with the two girls respectively). While Mahomet is wooing and urging Irena to become his queen, the two Greek nobles plan to kidnap the girls and escape by ship. Finally the secret plan is discovered by the Sultan, who by this time finds himself faced with the mutiny of his soldiers and "bassas." But thanks to the help of Justinianus, Honorius, and their friends, the rebellion is put down and the two Greek girls are magnanimously given back to their lovers by the grateful Sultan.

Now in Johnson's play the original story is elaborated on almost exactly the same lines, that is to say the same sub-story of the two Greek noblemen kidnapping the two Greek captive girls is added. Here again there is another Greek girl, Aspasia, who attends on Irene. There are also two Greek noblemen, Demetrius and Leontes, who, this time together with a Turk, plan an escape by ship. But in Johnson's version while Aspasia and Demetrius are in love with each other there is no question of love between Irene and Leontes. At the end the scheme is discovered and though Aspasia manages to escape with the two Greeks, Irene is killed.

Naturally there are many different incidents in the two plays, but that the changes made in the original story are basically identical cannot be denied. Moreover, the similarity is not confined to the outlines of the added story; it can also be observed in some of its details.

In the 1664 play, Irena and Perinthia conversing in the palace

garden lament the death of Justinianus and Honorius, whom they believe to have been killed during the capture of the city. Speaking of their loyalty to the memory of the men they love they wish that their constancy could be known to their "departed" souls.

Irena. I see Perinthia that Love, and Gratitude  
Equally balances our thoughts;  
And that we have an equal sence, of what  
We owe their memories.  
What would I give that, that now their generous souls,  
Had knowledge o'th constant affection  
We still bear'em?

Ah, that Heaven would but permit that their  
Souls might now from their blest abodes  
But come, and visit us; methinks't would be  
Some mitigation to our misfortunes. (III, ii.)

In Johnson, Aspasia while walking in the palace garden with Irene, mourns for Demetrius whom she believes to be dead, and hopes that her constancy is known to his soul.

Each generous Sentiment is thine, Demetrius,  
Whose Soul, perhaps yet mindful of Aspasia,  
Now hovers o'er this melancholy Shade,  
Well pleas'd to find thy Precepts not forgotten. (II, i, 38-41)

The similarity of the two scenes is most striking since no such incident takes place in Knolles.

In the 1664 play Justinianus and Honorius meet; Honorius tells his friend how he has prepared a plan to attack the palace, kidnap the girls, and escape by ship to another country.

Just. But pray, What number may our Friends amount  
To?

Hon. Why, about some five hundred, All stout, and  
Valiant persons, having bin formerly  
Most Officers under you: And if you  
Please but to command us, and lead us on,  
I doubt not the success. (II, i.)

In Johnson's play Leontius and Demetrius meet, the latter discloses the plan for the escape and, as in the earlier play, offers the command to his friend Leontius:

Deep in a winding Creek a Galley lies,  
Mann'd with the bravest of our fellow Captives,

Selected by my Care, a hardy Band,  
That long to hail thee Chief.

(I, i, 134-37)

It is said that the Irene story became in Johnson's hands "a drama of the struggle between virtue and weakness. Irene is represented not as a helpless victim of the Sultan's passion, but as the mistress of her fate," the great moralist "converted a record of senseless cruelty into a study of temptation."<sup>6</sup> But it must be admitted that this is partly true of the 1664 *Irena* as well, for Irena there is not represented as a helpless victim. The play, if not a study of temptation, is at least a story of temptation. For, as in Johnson's play, Mahomet continually woos Irena and invites her to become his queen.

Apart from these interesting resemblances we must note one more point which is common to the two plays and for which there is no foundation in Knolles: the plot against Sultan Mahomet's life. In the first play this is schemed by the Aga of the Janizaries, in Johnson by Cali Bassa and the Greeks, and both the Aga and Cali pay for their treason with their lives.

University of Istanbul

BERNA MORAN

## An Unattributed Story by Katherine Mansfield?

I am convinced that a story entitled "The Mating of Gwendolen," which appeared in *The New Age* for November 2, 1911 (Vol. x, p. 14), was written by Katherine Mansfield.

*The New Age* had printed at least fifteen of Katherine Mansfield's stories throughout 1910 and 1911, and printed two more in the spring of 1912. She was, then, a regular contributor at the time of the appearance of this story. Moreover, at least one other story, "A Marriage of Passion," attributed to Katherine Mansfield by Miss Berkman,<sup>1</sup> had appeared without the author's usual signature. "The Mating of Gwendolen" is signed "Mouche"—a signature which is interesting in light of Katherine Mansfield's recurrent metaphor of the fly.

Internal evidence is strong. The story is a satiric sketch of a

<sup>6</sup> N. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 234-35.

<sup>1</sup> Sylvia Berkman, *Katherine Mansfield* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1952), p. 212.

suburban mother and daughter, and ends with the daughter's engagement—purely for material reasons—to a man whom she secretly detests. Much of the story deals with Gwendolen's artistic affectation; she longs "to know 'artistic' and 'interesting' people," particularly an actor named William Waller.

Many of the stories written at this period deal with the themes implicit here: the theme of misalliance ("At Lehmann's," "Frau Brechenmacher Attends a Wedding"), the theme of mercenary betrothal ("The Modern Soul," "The Advanced Lady"), a satiric treatment of artistic affectation ("The Modern Soul," "The Advanced Lady"), and a woman's cool, objective, often cruel analysis of her own love affair ("The Swing of the Pendulum," "Frau Brechenmacher Attends a Wedding"). One important theme—a bitterly satiric treatment of bourgeois domestic life—appears not only in the *New Age* stories that were later collected as *In a German Pension*, but forms the basis of "A Marriage of Passion," a story which was published in *The New Age* four months after the publication of "The Mating of Gwendolen," and which most nearly resembles it in theme and treatment. In both stories the bourgeois home is portrayed as close, over-ripe, over-decorated, saccharine and hypocritical.

In style, too, "The Mating of Gwendolen" is Mansfieldian. Just as the bedroom, in "A Marriage of Passion," is described with lubricious overtones

When the ladies retired to the De Voteds' room to re-wrap themselves . . . they had the benefit of seeing yet another sign and token—of feeling yet another thrill. For pink-shaded lights glowed in the bedroom and the big pink velvet bed was unfolded like "a great rose," said childlike Ambergris. A fire burned on the hearth—and there was even a suspicion of pink silk and ribbon and lace. Marriage! —

so, in "The Mating of Gwendolen," there is the same connection between the color pink, softness of decor, and a distasteful mating:

The drawing-room showed a prevailingly pink note, a bewildering litter of cushions, flimsy draperies, with basket-chairs as islands of refuge. . . . In the evening a deeper glow of rose pink was suffused by a tall lamp with an enormous pink shade. And in the midst of all the rosiness, in the most comfortable basket chair, sat Jimmy.

Among the songs Gwendolen sings is "Pale hands pink tipped," while in the midst of the

pink glow, the sugary love songs, the feminine atmosphere—Jimmy felt like a gracious and powerful sultan.

The song too is characteristic of Katherine Mansfield, whose stories are full of snatches of songs, often used, in their excessive sweetness and sentimentality, for satiric purposes.

The style also shows the flippant humor that was typical of Katherine Mansfield's work at this time:

The widow of a tax-collector in India, Mrs Vere Jenkyns, on a small annuity, lived in perpetual wonderment as to why Providence did not make it bigger.

Home was a tiny flat in Kensington, which Mrs Vere Jenkyns refused to qualify as "West," thereby creating dire confusion in the minds of errand-boys and unaccustomed visitors.

In fact both ladies (as might be seen by a dainty badge dangling from their bracelets) were members of the W. W. W., the Worshippers of William Waller being a society numbering twelve chosen, enthusiastic female worshippers, chiefly from the suburbs.

If "A Marriage of Passion" is properly attributable to Katherine Mansfield, as her biographer thinks, then "The Mating of Gwendolen" seems equally so.<sup>2</sup>

University of Utah

JACK GARLINGTON

## Who Is Betty Byrne?

Joyce's autobiographical novel *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* begins with a story which Simon Dedalus tells his infant son Stephen.

Once upon a time and a very good time it was there was a moocow coming

<sup>2</sup> I wrote to John Middleton Murry about this story, along with two other corrections to the bibliography (Ruth Elvish Mantz' *Critical Bibliography* had assigned to Katherine Mansfield a review of Sappho printed in *Rhythm* for July 1912; and G. N. Morris had previously suspected that a dialogue-review of Synge's "Well of the Saints," signed by "The Two Tigers," was partially Katherine Mansfield's.) I received this answer from Mr. Murry: "To deal with certainties first—the review of Sappho is certainly not by K. M., probably by me. The dialogue review of Synge is, as you suppose, a collaboration between K. M. and myself. You are probably right about 'The Mating of Gwendolen'; but since I have never seen the story, I can't say for certain. I don't think—or can't remember—that she ever mentioned it to me."



down along the road and this moocow that was down along the road met a nice little boy named baby tuckoo. . . . [Spaced periods are Joyce's.]

His father told him that story: his father looked at him through a glass; he had a hairy face.

He was baby tuckoo. The moocow came down the road where Betty Byrne lived: she sold lemon platt.<sup>1</sup>

The careful reader observes that Mr. Dedalus is telling the story as an answer to the child's question: "Where did I come from?" Moreover, he identifies the cow as Stephen's mother. The same careful reader, however, if he does not know that names are very important to Joyce, is likely to dismiss "the road where Betty Byrne lived" as just a detail improvised by Stephen's father to add verisimilitude to the tale. Nevertheless, this phrase is very important in that it adds a mythic dimension to the story and relates it to one of the most important themes in the novel.

In order to understand the significance of this phrase, the reader must possess a seemingly irrelevant piece of information—namely, that the original of the character Cranly in *A Portrait* is J. F. Byrne, a college friend of Joyce's.<sup>2</sup> Then he must realize that Stephen conceives of himself as playing the role of Jesus to Cranly's John the Baptist.

Cranly is identified as the son of "Elizabeth and Zacchary. Then he is the precursor. Item: he eats chiefly belly bacon and dried figs. Read locusts and wild honey. Also, when thinking of him, saw always a stern severed head or death mask as if outlined on a grey curtain or veronica" (p. 293). Moreover, Stephen looks upon Cranly as a confessor, as someone with whom he can discuss his mission.

Stephen himself is marked as a sacrifice—as St. Stephen, the first Christian martyr, and as "Bous Stephanoumenos! Bous Stephane-foros!" (p. 195)—i. e., the sacrificial cow bearing the Divine Power and also bearing the crown of martyrdom. He refuses to acknowledge his putative father, Simon Dedalus, as his real father and instead invokes Dedalus the fabulous artificer—archetype of the artist—as his progenitor.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, Stephen records the following remarks in his notebook: "March 24. Began with a discussion with my mother [named Mary].<sup>4</sup> Subject: B. V. M. Handicapped by my

<sup>1</sup> P. 1. All citations of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* refer to the Modern Library edition (New York, 1928).

<sup>2</sup> See J. F. Byrne, *Silent Years* (New York, 1953).

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 294, 299 et al. See also *Ulysses*.

<sup>4</sup> It is true that James Joyce's mother was named Mary, but Joyce renamed, in *A Portrait* and *Ulysses*, almost all his friends and relatives. The fact that



sex and youth. To escape held up relations between Jesus and Papa against those between Mary and her son" (p. 294).

Stephen is comparing his relationship to his parents with that of Jesus to Mary and Joseph. In an argument with Cranly, Stephen likens his own refusal to make his mother happy by taking the Eucharist at Easter to Jesus' refusal to permit his mother to turn him from his duty.<sup>5</sup> Finally, in the course of expounding his esthetic theories to Lynch, Stephen compares the successful artist to God (p. 292).

But what is the relevance of all this to Betty Byrne? Betty Byrne's Christian name must be Elizabeth. She is therefore the mother of Cranly (J. F. Byrne) and of John the Baptist. Furthermore, as I said above, "the moocow" is Stephen's mother, whose name happens to be Mary. In other words, the first three paragraphs of *A Portrait*, for all their baby talk, are, on one level of meaning, a recapitulation of Luke's story of the Annunciation and of the subsequent visit paid by Mary to her cousin Elizabeth. "And the angel departed from her. And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Juda; and entered into the house of Zacharias [where Betty Byrne lived'], and saluted Elisabeth" (Luke i. 38-40).

Thus Joyce makes the mythic identification of Stephen with Jesus and Cranly with John the Baptist part of Stephen's earliest memory—or, to be more exact, of what seemed to the adult Stephen to be his earliest memory.

One phrase remains unexplained. Why does Joyce say that Betty Byrne "sold lemon platt"? I can say only that I am looking forward to finding out. Meanwhile I console myself with the probably apocryphal remark attributed to Joyce: "I expect my readers to devote their lives to the study of my work."

Hunter College

JULIAN B. KAYE

---

he retained his mother's Christian name unchanged seems to indicate that he found it suitable for the role he had assigned her.

<sup>5</sup> Pp. 285-6. The incident in the life of Jesus to which Stephen refers is described in Luke ii. 45-50 (all Biblical citations refer to the Authorized Version). In this passage there is "a discussion" between Mary and Jesus: "... and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.

"And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?"

## A Possible Source of the "Circe" Chapter of Joyce's *Ulysses*

The choice of a dramatic form for the "Circe" or "Night-Town" scene of *Ulysses* is one of the most ingenious strokes of Joyce's ingenious masterpiece. Probably no other form of presentation could have done justice to its teeming procession of subconscious thoughts. Although no real precedent for this fantastic drama has been found, there is evidence to indicate that it was influenced by Guillaume Apollinaire's *Les Mamelles de Tirésias*.<sup>1</sup>

The "Circe" chapter was written in 1919 and 1920 while Joyce was living in Trieste and Paris, and according to a letter he wrote on July 25th, 1920, it occupied him through the summer of that year. Apollinaire's play was published in 1918. Joyce knew of it when he came to Paris in June of 1920, for he mentioned it in a letter to Stanislaus Joyce as one of the indications of the city's strong current interest in the *Odyssey*.<sup>2</sup>

*Les Mamelles de Tirésias* is a whimsical and caustic farce in the tradition of Alfred Jarry's *Ubu-Roi*. Its heroine, Thérèse, after announcing to her husband that she is discontented with being a woman, is transformed into a man, grows a beard and mustache and adopts the name *Tirésias*. Her *mamelles* start from her bosom and float away upwards like balloons. Her husband is metamorphosed into a woman ("Puisque ma femme est homme / Il est juste que je sois femme" p. 52), and undertakes the project of repopulating the city of Zanzibar, producing exactly 40,050 children in a single day, one of whom is the author of a novel that has sold 600,000 copies. He creates his last child by putting torn newspapers, scissors, a penholder and a paste-pot into a cradle and dousing them with ink; out of the mess arises an adult journalist. When there is a complaint that he has overpopulated the city, a fortune-teller or *cartomancienne* appears to suggest that the people be fed with cards. At the end of the play she drops her disguise to reveal that she is Thérèse, restored to her original sex.

The most striking resemblance between the "Circe" scene and *Les Mamelles de Tirésias* is, of course, the reversal of sexes involving Bloom and Bella in the one and Thérèse and her husband in the other. There are, in addition, a number of minor similarities which, if they

<sup>1</sup> Éditions du Béliar, Paris, 1946.

<sup>2</sup> See Gorman's *James Joyce*, p. 268 and p. 273.

are interpreted as the results of Joyce's memory of the French play, offer supporting evidence of influence. Thérèse's husband, like Bloom, is painfully shy in his feminine incarnation. Bloom is blessed with a sudden and extravagant fertility, although he cannot rival the fecundity of Apollinaire's character, for he becomes the mother of eight gifted children who are "appointed to positions of high public trust" (Modern Library Edition, p. 484). The prudishness of Apollinaire's *cartomancienne* ("Toucher une femme quelle honte" p. 84) is found again in Mrs. Breen and the nymph from the picture in Bloom's bedroom, who tells him, "You are not fit to touch the garment of a pure woman" (p. 540). Apollinaire's characters, like Joyce's, sometimes indulge in a kind of witty echoism. When Thérèse announces that her name is henceforth *Tirésias*, her husband replies "*Adiousias*" (p. 42). He replies to a remark about a *caoutchouc* with "*Atchou*" and to "*Un rhume c'est exquis*" with "*Atchi*" (p. 52). This is paralleled in the "Circe" chapter by the retriever (p. 586-587) and the horse (p. 590-591) who turn the last words of human speeches into their characteristic cries, and by such exchanges as Lynch's "He is. A cardinal's son," followed by Stephen's "Cardinal sin" (p. 512).

Although it does not have the staggering imaginative energy of the "Circe" scene, *Les Mamelles* is the same sort of rich fantasy. The justification of his unconventional play given by Apollinaire in his prologue might be taken for a description of the "Circe" chapter.

Il est juste que le dramaturge se serve  
De tous les mirages qu'il a à sa disposition. . . .  
Il est juste qu'il fasse parler les foules des objets inanimés  
S'il lui plaît  
Et qu'il ne tienne pas plus compte du temps  
Que de l'espace  
Son univers est sa pièce  
A l'intérieur de laquelle il est le dieu créateur  
Qui dispose à son gré  
Les sons les gestes les démarches les masses les couleurs

—pp. 31-32.

If, as this evidence suggests, Joyce had *Les Mamelles de Tirésias* in mind when he wrote the "Circe" chapter, Apollinaire's method of dramatizing thoughts must have had a particular value for him. The fantastic events of *Les Mamelles* are simply the fulfillments of the characters' wishes. Similarly, such episodes of the "Circe" chapter as Bloom's coronation and his adoration by crowds of spec-

tators are his daydreams acted out. Joyce extended this device of translating thoughts into action, dramatizing Bloom's fears, memories, and sentimentalizing and Stephen's sense of guilt. Thus, the "Circe" chapter is a pageant of subconscious thoughts presented in the form of vivid episodes by a method possibly suggested to Joyce by Apollinaire's farce.

University of Washington

JACOB KORG

### *The Red Badge of Courage* and a Review of Zola's *La Débâcle*

Although most literary historians mention Zola's *La Débâcle* as a possible source of Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*, there is no convincing evidence that Crane ever read the Frenchman's naturalistic war novel. On the contrary, there is good reason to suppose that Crane never read the book. Thomas Beer, his first biographer, states that the young bohemian, absorbed in April of 1893 with the idea of a novel of the Civil War, threw Zola's story aside presumably after reading the first few pages.<sup>1</sup> Crane always denied any literary connection with Zola; in fact, he was deeply annoyed when his English acquaintances insisted upon his discipleship to the naturalists. "They stand me against the wall," he once complained, "with a teacup in my hand and tell me how I have stolen all my things from de Maupassant, Zola, Loti and the bloke who wrote—I forget the name."<sup>2</sup>

Yet *The Red Badge* so closely resembles *La Débâcle* in general plan, design, and intention that literary historians have always suspected that Crane had some knowledge of the precedent that had been set for him. An overall view of *La Débâcle*, without ever reading the novel itself, he may have got in the summer of 1892 from a review in the New York *Tribune* which provides a remarkable statement of the aims, method, and point of view of *The Red Badge of Courage*:

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Beer, *Stephen Crane: A Study in American Letters* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1923), pp. 97-98.

<sup>2</sup> *Stephen Crane: An Omnibus*, ed. Robert W. Stallman (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), p. 674.

Since no one is more painstaking than M. Zola in collecting and verifying the facts employed in his books, it is fair to assume that the representations in *La Débâcle* are trustworthy and not exaggerated. That they agree in the main with historical chronicles is self-evident, the one distinction between him and contemporary French historians being that he makes no effort to soften anything, but aims at presenting the truth of the terrible events he describes, as he has been able to ascertain it. It is the war with Germany which he treats here; not, of course, in detail, but upon large lines, marked by well-chosen pictures of particular episodes, intended to emphasize the chief causes of disaster. . . . In making his witnesses private soldiers or non-commissioned officers, he has clearly taken a leap from Tolstoy's *Peace and War* [sic]. . . . The plan is indeed a good one, his purpose being to show what the experiences and sufferings of the rank-and-file really were. . . .

The scene opens in a camp of raw troops near Mulhausen. The men are still full of the blind confidence which was expressed in the popular cry, "To the Rhine!" Yet nobody knew the plans of the generals, and they did not appear very clear about them themselves. Then came rumors of encounters, victories, defeats. Next came a confused series of marches, first in advance, then in retreat. From day to day the soldiers became more bewildered and irritated. . . . The heavy marching began to demoralize the young troops. . . . As to the individuals in the story, they are little more than pegs to hang descriptions upon. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Crane's novel resembles this description in several important particulars. *The Red Badge* opens with a depiction of the armies at rest, with soldiers waiting impatiently for orders to move and expressing doubts as to the competence of their generals. This sense of uncertainty, balanced against the mood of wild expectancy, is an integral part of the whole design of *The Red Badge*. The confused marching to and fro, the chaotic ordering and counter-ordering heightens the ominous business of war and furnishes an artistic foil to the disturbed mind of the young recruit whose doubts about his competency as a soldier are as strong as his sense of the futility of military maneuvering. Crane's basic purpose is precisely that which the reviewer attributes to Zola—"to show what the experiences of the rank-and-file really were." The young writer may have got here the idea of showing a raw recruit's struggle toward spiritual maturity.

Crane probably read this review, for it appeared in the issue of the *Tribune* which carried his sketch "The Broken-Down Van."<sup>4</sup> It was during this period that his first work, *The Sullivan County Sketches* and his Asbury Park pieces, were appearing for the first time in print, and Crane, as he confessed once to Louis Senger,<sup>5</sup> was

<sup>3</sup> New York *Tribune* (July 10, 1892), p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Hamlin Garland, *Roadside Meetings* (New York: Macmillan, 1930), p. 204.

searching about for materials for a "pot boiler" to bolster his almost nonexistent income. The popularity of Zola's novel, Crane's own interest in war, and his need for a popular success in all likelihood drew this review to his attention. When he turned to the composition of *The Red Badge*, it is altogether likely that he was guided in his choice of materials, method, and point of view by the reviewer's description of *La Dêbâcle*.

University of Texas

JAMES B. COLVERT

### Pierre de Beauvais' *Lacovie*

In Cahier's edition of the French thirteenth-century prose bestiary written by Pierre de Beauvais or le Picard, there is a chapter entitled: *Une beste qui est apelée lacovie*.<sup>1</sup> Following this title is the account of a creature resembling a whale, whose sand-covered back deceives sailors who think it an island. They land, disembark, and cook their food over a fire. When the whale feels the heat, it plunges to the depths, dragging with it ship and occupants.

It is not necessary to discuss here the origins of this ancient story nor the name *aspidochelone* which is given to this sea beast in most of the Latin versions of the *Physiologus*.<sup>2</sup> Our problem is to account for the name *lacovie*. Noting that the reading is *la coine* in another manuscript,<sup>3</sup> Cahier states: "mais ce pourrait bien n'être qu'une mauvaise variante. En adoptant *lacovie*, s'il s'agissait d'expliquer comment ce mot a pu désigner une baleine, je hasarderais d'y voir une altération du mot *maclovie* (bête de S. Malo, ou Maclou). Il se peut que ce nom ait été donné à l'énorme cétacé en mémoire de la légende qui racontait que saint Malo avait célébré la messe sur le dos d'une baleine." In listing the contents of this bestiary Paul Meyer asks: "Faut-il supposer que *Lacoin* ou *La Coine*, mot dont on ne connaît aucun autre exemple, est une corruption de *chelone*?"<sup>4</sup> A third statement, and one which leads to an explanation of the name,

<sup>1</sup> Charles Cahier and Arthur Martin, *Mélanges d'archéologie, d'histoire et de littérature* (Paris, 1853), III, 251. Cahier's edition is based on Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS. 3516.

<sup>2</sup> For a full discussion of these two questions see Albert S. Cook, *The Old English Elene, Phoenix, and Physiologus* (Yale, 1919), pp. lxiii-lxxxv.

<sup>3</sup> MS. R which is Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS. fr. 834 (formerly 7215<sup>a</sup>) of the fourteenth century.

<sup>4</sup> Paul Meyer, "Les Bestiaires," *HLEF*, xxxiv (1914), 388.



was made by the versatile scholar Montague Rhodes James. After relating the above story about the Aspidochelone, he says: "You meet this fish in the story of Sindbab the Sailor; you meet him also in the voyage of St. Brandan where he has a proper name of his own, Jasconius."<sup>6</sup>

In the Old French version of the Latin *Navigatio Sancti Brendani*, the following lines are found:

Lur caldere qu'il perdirent  
En l'an devant, or la virent;  
Li Jacoines l'ad gwardee,  
Or l'unt sur lui retruvee; \*

The glossary to the edition of this poem identifies *Jacoin* as the "name of the great fish," and a note explains that the word, representing *Jasconius* of the Latin *Navigatio*, has been preserved only in the A manuscript (London, Brit. Mus., Cotton Vesp. B. v, mid or second half of the thirteenth century), and that it is derived from the Irish *iasc* 'fish.'<sup>7</sup> Thus one can see that the *lacovie* or *la coine* in the manuscripts of Pierre de Beauvais is identical with the *Jacoin* of the *Voyage of St. Brendan*. The relationship of the three words is clear when the similarity of certain letters in a mediaeval manuscript is considered: the resemblance between the initial *l* and *J*, and that between the *vi* and *in*.

Sweet Briar College

FLORENCE McCULLOCH

## Note sur l'épithaphe de Rabelais par Ronsard

Ronsard a dit de Rabelais:

Il chantoit la grande massüe  
Et la jument de Gargantüe,  
Son fils Panurge, & les païs  
Des Papimanes ébaïs:  
Et chantoit les Iles Hieres  
Et frere Jean des autonnières,  
. . .<sup>1</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Montague Rhodes James, "The Bestiary," *History*, N.S. xvi, No. 61 (April 1931), 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Voyage of St. Brendan by Benedeit*, ed. E. G. R. Waters (Oxford, 1928), lines 836-839.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> *Oeuvres complètes*, éd. Laumonier (Paris: Hachette, 1930), vi, 22. Voir H. Chamard, *Histoire de la Pléiade* (Paris, 1939), II, 78-80.

Commentant ces vers, Jean Porcher déclare :

Les erreurs que fait Ronsard sur les noms propres (Panurge pour Pantagruel, Autonnières pour Entommeures) montrent qu'il n'était pas très familier avec l'œuvre du 'bon Rabelais qui boivait toujours cependant qu'il vivait'."<sup>2</sup>

Laumonier explique la seconde "erreur" de Ronsard sur les noms propres mentionnés par le poète. Celui-ci, prétend Laumonier, "écorche à dessein le nom de frère Jean. Les 'autonnières' sont sans doute les récoltes de l'automne, les vendanges. . ."<sup>3</sup> Mais aucun argument n'a été présenté pour rendre compte de "son fils Panurge." Or, nous relevons que la première édition des Oeuvres complètes, comprenant les quatre premiers livres, et la Prognostication pantagruéline, et publiée avec la date de 1553, mentionne, dans le titre, *la vie, faicts & dictz heroïques de Gargantua et de son filz Panurge*.<sup>4</sup> Ronsard publia pour la première fois l'épithaphe qui nous a intéressés dans le *Bocage* qui fut achevé d'imprimer le 27 novembre et parut avec le millésime 1554.<sup>5</sup> C'est ce qui a fait dire à Plattard: "Rabelais mourut donc vraisemblablement dans le second semestre de 1553 ou au début de 1554."<sup>6</sup> Ailleurs, Plattard a assuré: "Nous savons qu'il est mort en 1554."<sup>7</sup> Il nous semble donc probable que la première édition des Oeuvres complètes de Rabelais n'a pas été revue par lui<sup>8</sup> et que la "singulière bévue" qui, dans le titre, fait de Panurge le fils de Gargantua, a dû inspirer à Ronsard celle qui se lit dans l'épithaphe de Rabelais. Il resterait à expliquer cette erreur. Nous ne pouvons suggérer que ceci: nous avons montré que,<sup>9</sup> dans l'édition dite originale de *Pantagruel*, Rabelais annonce le mariage de Pantagruel tandis que, dans les éditions postérieures, c'est le mariage de Pantagruel et celui de Panurge qu'il fait attendre. On sait, en outre, que le *Tiers Livre* est consacré presque complètement à la question du mariage de Panurge et que Rabelais ne fait qu'une allusion à celui de Pantagruel dans un court chapitre (XLVIII) de

<sup>2</sup> *Rabelais. Notices bibliographiques et iconographiques par Jean Porcher* (Paris, 1933), p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> *Oeuvres*, VI, 22, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Porcher, p. 123. Rabelais, *Oeuvres complètes*, éd. J. Boulenger (Paris, 1934), p. 1019.

<sup>5</sup> Laumonier, p. xi.

<sup>6</sup> J. Plattard, *La vie de François Rabelais* (Paris et Bruxelles, 1928), p. 223.

<sup>7</sup> Pantagruel (Paris: Centre de Documentation Universitaire, 1939), p. 17.

<sup>8</sup> Dans *La vie*, Plattard dit (p. 225): "La première [édition des *Oeuvres complètes*] avait paru en 1553 et vraisemblablement sans l'aveu de l'auteur."

<sup>9</sup> "La Géographie de *Pantagruel* et les chroniques gargantuines," *MLN* (Avril 1954), 260-264.



ce même *Tiers Livre*.<sup>10</sup> Dans le roman rabelaisien, Panurge a, peu à peu, pris le pas sur Pantagruel et, au lieu de nous intéresser au mariage du fils de Gargantua, Rabelais a introduit le personnage de Panurge. Les chroniques gargantuines contaient les aventures du fils de Grantgosier; mais, tout en continuant le récit des *chroniques*, Rabelais a créé un personnage tout nouveau, Panurge, pour lequel les *chroniques* n'offraient aucun modèle. Les livrets gargantuins et la légende dont ils étaient des rédactions devaient, pourtant, être si familiers aux hommes du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle que ceux-ci ont été amenés naturellement à supposer que Rabelais s'occupait du fils de Gargantua, dans le *Tiers* et le *Quart Livres*, et que ce fils était Panurge. En tout cas, il est curieux que la même "bêvue" ait été faite par l'imprimeur de la première édition des œuvres complètes de Rabelais, et par Ronsard, en 1553 et 1554 respectivement.

Harvard University

MARCEL FRANÇON

## Pascal et l'édition des *Pensées*

Nous voulons signaler ici une particularité passée inaperçue qui est capable de jeter une lumière neuve sur le sens de quelques renvois semés à travers le manuscrit des *Pensées*. En effet, le ton de certaines indications données par Pascal nous amène à proposer la notion de Pascal préparant lui-même son texte en vue soit d'une édition posthume, soit d'un usage du manuscrit par une autre personne.

Le fragment 281-540<sup>1</sup> se termine par la phrase suivante écrite de la main de Pascal: "Voyez le rond dans Montaigne." Nous pensons qu'il s'agit d'une marque faite par Pascal en marge de son exemplaire des *Essais*, et non, comme quelques-uns le croient, du rappel d'une image qui aurait frappé Pascal. De même, la mention "Autre rond," écrite de la main de Nicole en tête du fragment 290-567, renvoie certainement à une deuxième marque faite par Pascal dans son exemplaire des *Essais*. Sans doute, voulait-il citer Montaigne à ces deux endroits de son texte. Peu importe; ce qui nous intéresse im-

<sup>10</sup> Boulenger, pp. 516-520.

<sup>1</sup> Le premier numéro d'ordre renvoie aux *Pensées*, éd. L. Lafuma (Paris, Editions du Luxembourg, 1951); le deuxième numéro d'ordre renvoie aux *Pensées*, éd. L. Lafuma (Paris, Delmas, 1952).

médiatement est de déterminer pourquoi Pascal emploie l'impératif "voyez." On n'aurait jamais l'idée de griffonner une note pour soi à l'impératif. Alors, quel en est le sens?

D'une main étrangère, le fragment 178-363 ne contient qu'une seule phrase commandée par l'impératif: "Voyez les 2 sortes d'hommes dans le titre: Perpétuité."

Le fragment 222-424 n'est pas de la main de Pascal, mais au verso du feuillet Pascal a inscrit: "Voyez perpétuité."

De la main de Pascal, le fragment 223-430 peut également être interprété comme une indication d'auteur à éditeur: "Il faut mettre au chapitre des fondements ce qui est en celui des figuratifs touchant la cause des figures."

Le fragment 366-682, qui n'est pas de la main de Pascal, porte entre parenthèses la mention "Voyez perpétuité."

On remarquera de suite que toutes ces indications proviennent du chapitre Perpétuité ou renvoient au chapitre Perpétuité, sauf celle de la main de Nicole au fragment 290-567 qui se trouve être le premier fragment du chapitre Preuves de Moïse, chapitre qui vient immédiatement après celui de Perpétuité dans la Copie 9203.

On ne saurait soutenir que ces notations ne sont pas le fait de Pascal, car deux des quatre renvois à l'impératif sont de sa main. Quelle conclusion en tirer? Que Pascal a laissé des indications pour une tierce personne, ceci à l'occasion d'une lecture ou du reclassement du chapitre Perpétuité. Cette personne était-elle un secrétaire? Un ami à qui Pascal avait prêté le manuscrit? Ou encore, ces indications ne seraient-elles pas destinées à un futur éditeur? Il est possible que Pascal ait songé au cours de sa maladie à insérer quelques notes pour éclairer son éditeur. Alors, pourquoi est-ce que ses proches n'en ont pas fait usage? Sans doute, parce que Pascal ne leur a pas laissé suffisamment de renvois. Peut-être n'a-t-il pas eu le désir de conduire son entreprise à terme.

Malgré le manque actuel de preuves, la notion de Pascal préparant une édition posthume de l'Apologie peut retenir notre attention.

*Duke University*

J.-J. DEMOREST

## Musset, de Quincey, and Piranesi

The fascination of Piranesi's *Imaginary Prisons* for the literary mind is attested by transmutations in story, poem, and essay. In a recent attempt to explain the appeal, Aldous Huxley remarks that the etchings express obscure psychological truths: they represent "metaphysical prisons, whose seat is within the mind, whose walls are made of nightmare and incomprehension, whose chains are anxiety and their racks a sense of personal and even generic guilt."<sup>1</sup> Whatever the explanation may be, the influence of the *Prisons* on writers of the last two centuries, particularly on the Romantics, will one day make a chapter of literary history which will include the names of Walpole, Beckford,<sup>2</sup> Coleridge, De Quincey, Balzac, Gautier, Baudelaire, and doubtless many others. This paper adds one name to the list and in so doing calls attention to an instance of plagiarism.

A quarter of a century after publishing an excessively free translation of De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*, Alfred de Musset took a further liberty with that classic by appropriating a passage of over two hundred words from it.

In the short story "La Mouche"<sup>3</sup> a chevalier from the provinces presents himself at the court of Louis XV in the hope of getting a commission in the guards and thus becoming an eligible suitor of the girl he loves. With no sponsor but lady luck he enters the palace of Versailles and goes in search of a hall where, he has heard, the king and Madame de Pompadour are attending an opera. While wandering alone through a maze of corridors, stairways, halls, and apartments, dazzled by his first sight of the palace, he soon becomes lost, an episode that serves the author as pretext for dwelling on the splendors of the *ancien régime*. Finally the young man's impatience overcomes his curiosity as he realizes he may miss a chance of confronting the king. At this point the following analogy to his sensations is introduced:

<sup>1</sup> "Variations on *The Prisons*," *Themes and Variations* (New York, 1950), pp. 207-208.

<sup>2</sup> Jorgen Andersen ("Giant Dreams: Piranesi's Influence in England," *English Miscellany*, published for The British Council [Rome, 1952], III, 49-59) shows that Walpole and Beckford were both familiar with the work of Piranesi and suggests that the architectural fantasies of *The Castle of Otranto* and *Vathek* owe something to the *Prisons*. "There is a passage still unexplored leading from the *Carceri* into the strongly echoing vaults of the English Gothic novel." (p. 51).

<sup>3</sup> Appeared first in feuilleton in *Le Moniteur universel* in December and January, 1853-54, and then in *Contes* (Charpentier, Paris), 1854; frequently reissued since.

Dans les *Antiquités de Rome*, de Piranési, il y a une série de gravures que l'artiste appelle "ses rêves," et qui sont un souvenir de ses propres visions durant le délire d'une fièvre. Ces gravures représentent de vastes salles gothiques; sur le pavé sont toutes sortes d'engins et de machines, roues, câbles, poulies, leviers, catapultes, etc., etc., expression d'énorme puissance mise en action et de résistance formidable. Le long des murs, vous apercevez un escalier, et sur cet escalier, grimpant, non sans peine, Piranési lui-même. Suivez les marches un peu plus haut, elles s'arrêtent tout à coup devant un abîme. Quoi qu'il soit advenu du pauvre Piranési, vous le croyez du moins au bout de son travail, car il ne peut faire un pas de plus sans tomber; mais levez les yeux, et vous voyez un second escalier qui s'élève en l'air, et sur cet escalier encore, Piranési sur le bord d'un autre précipice. Regardez encore plus haut, et un escalier encore plus aérien se dresse devant vous, et encore le pauvre Piranési continuant son ascension, et ainsi de suite, jusqu'à ce que l'éternel escalier et Piranési disparaissent ensemble dans les nues, c'est-à-dire dans le bord de la gravure.<sup>4</sup>

This paragraph is noteworthy for two reasons. First, it is inapt in substance and tone. The mild vertigo of Musset's chevalier lost in Versailles has little in common with the aspiring suicidal mania of Piranesi. Second, except for the suppression of the first personal pronoun and mention of Coleridge, the paragraph is a close translation from that part of the *Confessions* in which, under the heading of "The Pains of Opium," De Quincey tries to convey a sense of the "insufferable splendor" of his architectural dreams.

Many years ago, when I was looking over Piranesi's *Antiquities of Rome*, Mr. Coleridge, who was standing by, described to me a set of plates by that artist, called his *Dreams*, and which record the scenery of his own visions during the delirium of a fever. Some of them (I describe only from memory of Mr. Coleridge's account) represented vast Gothic halls: on the floor of which stood all sorts of engines and machinery, wheels, cables, pulleys, levers, catapults, etc. etc. expressive of enormous power put forth, and resistance overcome. Creeping along the sides of the walls, you perceived a staircase; and upon it, groping his way upwards, was Piranesi himself: follow the stairs a little further, and you perceive it come to a sudden abrupt termination, without any balustrade, and allowing no step onwards to him who had reached the extremity, except into the depths below. Whatever is to become of poor Piranesi, you suppose, at least, that his labours must in some way terminate here. But raise your eyes, and behold a second flight of stairs still higher: on which again Piranesi is perceived, but this time standing on the very brink of the abyss. Again elevate your eye, and a still more aerial flight of stairs is beheld: and again is poor Piranesi busy on his aspiring labours: and so on, until the unfinished stairs and Piranesi both are lost in the upper gloom of the hall.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. E. Biré (Paris, 1907-1911), vi, 237-238.

<sup>5</sup> The text followed here is that of the first edition (Taylor and Hessey, London, 1822), pp. 163-164, as reprinted from the *London Magazine*, Sept.

The plagiarized paragraph in "La Mouche" was not Musset's first indebtedness to the *Confessions*. In 1828, at the age of eighteen, he made his debut as a prose writer with a little volume entitled *L'Anglais mangeur d'opium*, purporting to be a translation from the English but in actuality an adaptation. Apart from his failure to catch humorous overtones and his errors due to imperfect knowledge of English, there are several suppressions, an invented episode, and an interpolated nightmare suggested by his attendance at dissections during his brief studies in medicine.<sup>6</sup> His most astonishing alteration is a Gallic sequel to the story of the prostitute Ann, in which the opium-eater rediscovers her, bedecked with diamonds and on the arm of a marquis, at a ball, later fights a duel in her behalf, and then carries her off to live with him. By implication she takes the place of Margaret, De Quincey's wife, as the fair companion of the cottage in the mountains. Liberties as willful as these indicate that Musset, far from recognizing the work as already an English classic, supposed it to be obscure enough that he would not be found out. Clearly he was serving his apprenticeship as a romancer as well as translator. Even the passage on Piranesi in the *Mangeur* is a less exact rendering of De Quincey than the same passage pilfered in "La Mouche." In the twenty-five years separating the two indiscretions Musset's respect for the original seems to have grown.

Unluckily, however, he took on faith the substance of the paragraph. If he had examined the twenty-nine volumes of an edition of Piranesi's collected works published in Paris in 1835-1839, he would have found no plates that can be identified as answering precisely to De Quincey's description, and no set of etchings entitled "Dreams." De Quincey, in the only details omitted from the passage in "La Mouche," makes excuse for possible distortion by admitting that he writes only from memory of Coleridge's account heard many years before. Impressions distilled in Coleridge's imagination and redistilled in De Quincey's are likely to undergo "sublimation strange." This appears to have happened to the Piranesi etchings that Coleridge had seen. One looks in vain in the published works for the figure of the artist on his desperate mission.

Oct. 1821. Several verbal changes in this passage appear in the enlarged version of the *Confessions* of 1856. Musset made his translation from the third edition (1823), a reprint of the first.

<sup>6</sup>See Randolph Hughes, "Vers la contrée du rêve: Balzac, Gautier et Baudelaire, disciples de Quincey," *Mercure de France*, Aug. 1, 1939, p. 564 note. Also Paul Peltier, "Musset et Baudelaire à propos des *Confessions d'un Mangeur d'opium*," *Mercure de France*, Dec. 16, 1918, pp. 640-642.

The plates that best answer in spirit to the Coleridge-De Quincey description are the set of sixteen entitled *Carceri d'Invenzione*, done in their first state about 1745,<sup>7</sup> when the Italian artist was in his mid-twenties, and reworked later. Unfettered by architectural meaning or rule, these colossal prison interiors, with vaults repeated in depth, stairways, galleries and drawbridges at dizzying heights, engines of torture, and faceless human figures, spring from an imagination of great power. Here is prefigured the phantasmagoria of guilt and despair of many a later romantic genius. "The *Prisons*," writes a recent critic of Piranesi, "fascinate because their abstract patterns are like clouds, or ink blots, or the cracks and stains on a wall, in which each man sees the projection of his deepest disturbances. They are Piranesi's only landscapes of the mind."<sup>8</sup>

Landscapes now of the collective mind of Piranesi, Coleridge, and De Quincey, rendered with slight inaccuracy in the *Mangeur*, the *Prisons* passed through another cycle of transmutations in France in the years following 1828. The old view that Musset's translation went unregarded by his contemporaries has been disproved. Randolph Hughes has shown that Balzac, writing in 1830, placed the *Mangeur* at the head of a list of the most important works of the period, that Gautier was almost certainly familiar with it, and that Baudelaire probably discovered De Quincey through it before making his own translation.<sup>9</sup> Mr. Hughes quotes from each of these writers lines of Piranesque imagery which point to the above-quoted passage from the *Confessions*, or its first French version, as immediate source.<sup>10</sup> The indebtedness of Musset and his three contemporaries to De Quincey is not confined to that short passage.<sup>11</sup> But that all four should have been haunted by the Coleridge-De Quincey description of the plates, Musset enough to covet it for his own, is authentic testimony to the vitality of the appeal of the *Prisons* and of their English interpretation.

St. Lawrence University

PAUL F. JAMIESON

<sup>7</sup> The date is conjectural. See Arthur M. Hind, *Giovanni Battista Piranesi: A Critical Study* (London, 1922), pp. 11-12, 81.

<sup>8</sup> A. Hyatt Mayor, *Giovanni Battista Piranesi* (New York, 1952), pp. 29-30.

<sup>9</sup> "Vers la contrée," pp. 562-563, 579, 592. On the question of Baudelaire's previous knowledge of Musset's translation, see also George Thomas Clapton, "Baudelaire et De Quincey," *Etudes françaises*, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," Oct. 1, 1931, p. 3, note 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 561, 567, 579-580. For Baudelaire parallels, see also Clapton, pp. 64-65.

<sup>11</sup> Peltier (pp. 642-643) notes a few traces of the influence of De Quincey in Musset's works, but overlooks the plagiarized paragraph in "La Mouche."



## A Note on the *Comedia Serafina* and *El Conde Alarcos*

The publication of the *Comedia Serafina* for the first time in the *Propaladia* establishes the year 1517 as a *terminus ad quem* for this play, which Crawford believed was the last one written by Torres Naharro before the first edition of the *Propaladia* was printed.<sup>1</sup> About this time several *pliegos sueltos* of the ballad *El Conde Alarcos* appeared, all of them undated. Henry Thomas describes a Seville edition to which he assigns a date of *circa* 1515 after comparing its typographical characteristics with the known practice of its printer, Jacob Cromberger, around that year.<sup>2</sup> This appears to be the earliest known copy of the *romance*.

The *Comedia Serafina*, which has a plot situation strikingly analogous to that of *El Conde Alarcos*, is the earliest dramatic work to reveal the influence of the latter. J. P. W. Crawford summarized the plot of the *Serafina* as follows:

... the *Comedia Serafina* . . . describes the predicament of the young Floristán on finding himself with two wives, a Valencian *demi-mondaine* named Serafina, and Orfea, an Italian lady whom he had married at his father's orders. Serafina, accompanied by her maid Dorosía, follows her erring lover to Rome and upbraids him, in impassioned Valencian, for his infidelity. Floristán generously assumes all the blame, which is self-evident, renews to her his pledge of undying love and declares that either he or Orfea must die. After due consideration, he finally settles upon the former alternative. He confides his purpose to the Friar Teodoro, who cynically promises his aid, but insists that the lady must have an opportunity to confess her fault. Floristán explains tenderly to Orfea why her death is necessary to him, and she, like a dutiful wife, pardons him for his offense and prays to God for mercy! The *dénouement* is brought about by Teodoro's suggestion that since Orfea's marriage to Floristán had not been consummated, she should marry Policiano, Floristán's brother, who had returned quite opportunely to Rome, and who had long been in love with her.<sup>3</sup>

The *Andria* of Terence has much in common with the *Serafina*, as Crawford indicated.<sup>4</sup> He goes on to say that it was Torres

<sup>1</sup> *Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega* (Philadelphia, 1937), 92.

<sup>2</sup> *Early Spanish Ballads in the British Museum; II: Romance del conde Alarcos* . . . (Cambridge, 1927), 5-6.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 93-96.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 92; also J. P. W. Crawford, "Two Notes on the Plays of Torres Naharro," *Hispanic Review*, v (1937), 78. A. Lenz, in 1923, denied any classical influence on the *Serafina*: "Aucune influence antique ne se fait sentir dans ses pièces réalistes, la *Tinellaria* et la *Soldadesca*, ni dans ses comédies romanesques la *Serafina* et l'*Imenea*" (*Revue Hispanique*, LVII (1923), 99).

Naharro's wont to imitate the Latin comedies of Terence and Plautus; for example, the *Comedia Calamita* has elements of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*, the *Aquilana* elements of Plautus' *Asinaria*.<sup>5</sup> However, Crawford does not mention the ballad *El Conde Alarcos* as one of the sources of the *Serafina*. Although this indebtedness of Torres Naharro to the *romance* has been casually mentioned by Rajna,<sup>6</sup> Gillet<sup>7</sup> and others, it has not been the object of a detailed study.

In the *romance*, the Conde has had amours with the Infanta, and has promised to marry her, but is now married to another woman, whom he loves. At the behest of the melancholy Infanta, the King persuades the Conde to kill his wife and marry her, alleging that the royal honor requires both acts. The Conde, whose *sentimiento monárquico* prevails over his strong indignation and sorrow, obeys, after a heart-rending interview with his wife. The latter forgives him and cites the King and his daughter to appear before the divine tribunal within thirty days. All concerned die within the term of this *emplazamiento*.

In the ballad and later dramatic versions of the *Alarcos* legend, the Conde's dilemma is made to arise naturally and inexorably out of the conflict between family affection and a strong sense of loyalty to king and given word. Although the honor theme had been employed effectively by Torres Naharro in the *Comedia Imenea*, it is not exploited in the *Serafina*, which is rather Italianate and Renaissance in spirit than essentially Spanish. The notable gaucherie with which thematic material from *El Conde Alarcos* has been incorporated in the play leaves us in some doubt as to the author's real purpose; Menéndez y Pelayo's characterization of the *Serafina* as "un puro disparate, bastante divertido, que tiene más de bufonesco que de trágico,"<sup>8</sup> is rejected by Crawford:

In my opinion Naharro did not write the play as a *bufonada*, but it un-

Since he did not indicate any specific Italian or other intermediary source, his assertion will not stand up against the evidence of Plautine influence.

<sup>5</sup> *Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega*, op. cit., 93-96.

<sup>6</sup> "Osservazioni e dubbi concernenti la storia delle romanze spagnuole," *Romanic Review*, VI (1915), 21.

<sup>7</sup> It should be observed that Gillet does not categorically state that *El Conde Alarcos* was a source: "... It may well be that the *romance del Conde Alarcos* inspired his *Comedia Serafina*" ("A Neglected Chapter in the History of the Spanish Romance," *Revue Hispanique*, LVI (1922), 457).

<sup>8</sup> *Propaladia de Bartolome de Torres Naharro* . . . Tomo II (*Libros de Antaño*, X), cxx.



doubtedly deserves that name today owing to the poet's awkwardness in handling his source materials.\*

A comparison of the two works reveals that the *Andria* is indeed suggested in the predicament of Floristán and his two wives; however, the parallel is equally striking between the *scène à faire* of *El Conde Alarcos* and Orfea's self-effacing speech in the third act of the *Serafina*, in which she signifies submission to her husband's decision to put her to death. Several details of plot and language appear to point, in the aggregate, to an unmistakable connection between the two works. Torres Naharro, no doubt intrigued by the coincidence of dramatic situation in the *Andria* and *El Conde Alarcos*, easily recast the pathos-rich episode, as will be seen in the analogous passages below:

Orfea's concern for Floristán when he appears, suffering from obvious anxiety, is paralleled in *El Conde Alarcos*:

¿Qué habéis, el conde Alarcos?

¿Por qué lloráis, vida mía,

que venís tan demudado

que cierto no os conocía?

No parece vuestra cara

ni el gesto que ser solía;

dadme parte del enojo

como dais de la alegría.

¿Decíme lo luego, conde,

no matéis la vida mía!

(123-27)<sup>10</sup>

Oimè, t'increixe il parlare?

¿Forsa sei in qualche afano?

(III, 243-44)<sup>11</sup>

. . . Si per me gli è fato errore,

ti piaccia mi lo se(r)oprire.

Si 'gli è cosa no da dire,

e di me voi questa uita,

sia o non sia fallita,

io son nata per patire.

(III, 251-56)

Doncha dimi, car' signore,

¿qual tuo male, qual tuo danno,

qual tuo stento, qual tuo afanno

no hè in mezo del mio cuore?

(III, 265-68)

In both cases the victim is urged to commend herself to God:

. . . encomendáos á Dios,

que esto hacerse tenía.

(179)

Poned vuestra alma en la vía

qual es mejor para vos,

y encomendadvos a Dios

que os tome en su compañía.

(III, 277-80)

\* Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega, op. cit., 92.

<sup>10</sup> The quotations from *El Conde Alarcos* are from S. G. Morley, *Spanish Ballads* (New York, 1911), 64-72.

<sup>11</sup> The quotations from the *Serafina* are from the edition of Joseph E. Gillet, *Propalladia and Other Works of Bartolome de Torres Naharro* (Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1946), II.

A former marriage is revealed by Floristán, and a former engagement by the Conde:

Sabed que en tiempo pasado  
yo amé á quien servía,  
la cual era la infanta.  
Por desdicha vuestra y mía  
prometí casar con ella,  
y á ella que le placía . . .

(151-53)

. . . sabed que yo era casado  
quando con vos me casé.  
Secretamente tomé  
la muger que me cumplía;  
mi padre no lo sabía,  
dio's en mi nombre la fe.

(III, 291-96)

Floristán admits his blame to Orfea, while the Conde makes a similar admission to himself:

Yo soy el triste culpado,  
esta culpa toda es mía.

(116)

Aunque no quiero negar  
ser la culpa mía toda,  
porque aquesta triste boda  
yo la pudiera escusar . . .

(III, 297-300)

Floristán directs Orfea to say a prayer before he commits the act, and in *El Conde Alarcos* the Condesa requests permission to pray:

— Dejáisme decir, buen Conde  
una oración que sabía.

— Decilda presto, condesa,  
enantes que venga el día.

(180-81)

. . . demandad a Dios paciencia  
para mejor acabar.

(III, 303-04)

Both women are forgiving. Praying to God, Orfea asks his forgiveness for Floristán, while the Condesa pardons the Conde herself:

— A vos yo perdono, conde,  
por amor que os tenía.

(194)

Anchor' ti priego, perdona  
le mane di Fioristano,  
che non san' quel che si fano . . .

(III, 321-23)

Floristán wants Orfea to make haste with her prayer, and the Conde makes a similar request:

Decilda presto, condesa,  
enantes que venga el día.

(181)

Señora, la dilación  
en esto no es nada buena,  
porque dobláis vuestra pena  
y acrescentáis mi pasión.  
Dad fin a vuestra oración . . .

(III, 369-73)

As a further argument in support of the influence of *El Conde Alarcos* on the *Comedia Serafina*, attention is called to what I believe is a hitherto unnoticed allusion to the superstition of the *emplazami-*

ento (citation of an evil-doer before divine justice),<sup>12</sup> examples of which are found in *El Conde Alarcos* and in at least two romances dealing with the reign of Fernando IV ('el emplazado'): "Válasme, nuestra Señora" (Durán no. 960)<sup>13</sup> and "A Don Pedro y Don Alonso" (Durán no. 961).<sup>13</sup>

Compare the account of the *emplazamiento* near the end of *El Conde Alarcos* with Lenicio's characteristic burlesque of the motif in the *Serafina*:

A vos yo perdono, conde,  
por amor que os tenía;  
mas yo no perdono al rey,  
ni á la infanta su hija,  
sino que quedan citados  
delante la alta justicia  
que allá vayan á juicio  
dentro de los treinta días.

Yo, señor, soi auisado  
que tus bodas ha sabido;  
dize que eras su marido,  
sobre lo qual te ha emplazado.

(I, 173-76)

(194-97)

If, as I believe, Torres Naharro had *El Conde Alarcos* in mind when writing the *Serafina*, the above would appear to be a specific reference, rather than a general allusion to the rather widespread legend. *Emplazado*, not very weighty in itself, becomes more compelling evidence in conjunction with the other elements which appear to be derived from the ballad.

What is the significance of the apparently almost coincident publication of the play and one of its sources? The studies of the *Alarcos* ballad made by Gorra,<sup>14</sup> Menéndez y Pelayo,<sup>15</sup> Menéndez Pidal<sup>16</sup> and others establish its remote origin, rendering superfluous any discussion of the priority of the ballad over the play. May we not assume that Torres Naharro already was familiar with this folklore theme, which was in the popular tradition in more than one version<sup>17</sup> before being

<sup>12</sup> "Emplazado. El que es llamado por el juez para que parezca a juicio. El rey don Fernando el Quarto fué llamado el Emplazado, porque aviendo condenado a muerte a unos cavalleros dichos Carvajales, le citaron para el tribunal de la justicia divina, y murió dentro del plaço que le señalaron" (Covarrubias, *Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana o Española* . . . Edición preparada por Martín de Riquer (Barcelona, 1943), 509.

<sup>13</sup> *Romancero General*, BAE XVI.

<sup>14</sup> E. Gorra, "Un dramma di Federigo Schlegel," *Nuova Antologia*, LXV (1896), 431-459.

<sup>15</sup> *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos* (Madrid, 1890-1908), XII, 536-540 and *passim*.

<sup>16</sup> "Poesía popular y romancero," *Revista de Filología Española*, III (1916), 233-289.

<sup>17</sup> I have listed twenty oral versions collected in Europe and America by folklorists in recent times.

printed? If so, his awareness of its dramatic possibilities<sup>18</sup> perhaps dates from his perusal of the relatively artistic, more polished version which was current in the *pliegos sueltos*, and the *Serafina* must have been composed during the period from *circa* 1515 to 1517.

The possibility that we have underestimated the importance of the *Romancero* in the dramatic art of Torres Naharro is an intriguing one. Crawford has suggested that his *Aquilana* may be indebted to a *romance* source, not yet identified,<sup>19</sup> and, in regard to the same author's *Dialogo del Nacimiento*, he says the play "comes to an end with the shepherds singing the *romance* 'Triste estaba el padre Adan,' . . . the earliest example of a *romance* used in a Spanish play."<sup>20</sup> However, these and other merely sporadic occurrences of ballad material in sixteenth century plays reported by Gillet,<sup>21</sup> and by Menéndez Pidal,<sup>22</sup> would appear not to impugn the traditional appraisal of Juan de la Cueva's role as the first to systematically exploit the *romancero*.

*The University of the South*

TIMOTHY PICKERING

## Galdós' *La de los tristes destinos* and Its Shakespearean Connections

Don Benito Pérez Galdós' fortieth *Episodio Nacional*, written during the first five months of 1907, bears the striking title *La de los tristes destinos*.<sup>1</sup> Galdós' choice of title is striking especially because it is so unusual as to be entirely without parallel among his more

<sup>18</sup> Included in the number of those who have realized the dramatic possibilities of *El Conde Alarcos* are Lope de Vega, G. de Castro, Mira de Amescua, Pérez de Montalbán, Friedrich Schlegel, José Milanés, Jacinto Grau, Benjamin Disraeli and others.

<sup>19</sup> *Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega*, *op. cit.*, 95.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>21</sup> Gillet reports that the *Auto de Clarino* (Toledo? 1555?) of Antonio Díez "adapts one historical *romance* and parodies another," and says allusions to *romances* and snatches of quotations are frequently found in sixteenth century plays" ("A Neglected Chapter in the History of the *Romance*," *op. cit.*, 457.

<sup>22</sup> "Alonso de la Vega (m. antes de 1566) para su comedia de la *Duquesa de la Rosa* se inspiró en alguno de los *romances* del *Conde Claros* (A caza va el emperador), de la *Duquesa de Lorreina*, o de la Emperatriz de Alemania, por más que Schack dice que tomó su asunto de *Bandello*" (*La leyenda de los Infantes de Lara* (Madrid, 1934), 121).

<sup>1</sup> Perlado, Páez y Cía., Madrid, 1907.

than a hundred other novels and plays. Not only is it epithetic and personal, as many Galdós titles are; it is also lyrically poetic, it has the rhythm and metrical structure of an octosyllabic *verso de romance*, and it is expressed with a double adjectival modification—prepositional phrase and individual adjective—of connotative and subjective values unknown in Galdós' other, but very few, approximations.<sup>2</sup>

In referring thus to Spain's Queen Isabel II, Galdós' title corresponds to an affectionate and sympathetic feeling for her which he consistently manifested elsewhere—explicitly and in detail in two essays, one of them fairly long,<sup>3</sup> in his *Memorias*,<sup>4</sup> and in various ways, although never in these terms, in six social and twenty-five historical novels.<sup>5</sup> Galdós believed her to be essentially kind and generous, far more sinned against than sinner, and genuinely the victim of circumstances and events, some of them even malevolently designed, quite beyond her control in her own education and marriage and in the national turmoil.

Midway through the *Episodio* Galdós has the Marqués de Beramendi imagine Isabel II as "York's wife" and bid farewell to her in a mute speech.<sup>6</sup> A part of that speech is printed in italics, a frequent means of indicating a quotation, and reads: "*Adiós, mujer de York, la de los tristes destinos.*"<sup>7</sup> With these textual hints, it is easy both to identify the source and to discover that the passage is indeed a translation of Shakespeare's *Richard III*, IV, iv. 114: "Farewell, York's wife, and queen of sad mischance."

Although the influence of Shakespeare on Galdós still remains to

<sup>1</sup> The adjectives *romántica* and *encantado* in *La estafeta romántica* and *El caballero encantado* are purely objective denotative definitions, "el Empecinado" in the title of the ninth *Episodio* is a popular epithet for the guerrillero Juan Martín. *La Fontana de Oro* repeats a proper name (of a café) and *La loca de la casa* is a popular expression for "the imagination." The symbolism, often ironic, of such titles as *Doña Perfecta*, *Torquemada en la hoguera*, etc. is essentially critical and hence quite different in nature.

<sup>2</sup> "La Reina Isabel," written in April 1904, and published in *Memoranda* (Madrid, 1906), pp. 17-34; and nineteen years earlier, "La Familia real de España," prepared originally for periodical publication on November 3, 1885, and later issued in Ghirardo's collection of *Obras inéditas*, Vol. III ("Política española") (Madrid, 1923), especially pp. 93-94.

<sup>3</sup> Written in 1916 for the Madrid periodical *La Esfera*; see *Obras inéditas* (Madrid, [1930]), Vol. x, pp. 44, 235.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the *censos de personajes galdosianos* in F. C. Sáinz de Robles, *Obras completas de Don Benito Pérez Galdós* (Madrid, 1941-1942), Vols. III, pp. 1381 ff., and VI, pp. 1777 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Galdós' characteristic psychological method—the exteriorization of thoughts and feelings in words even when not spoken aloud.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 150.

be studied, the latter's admiration for the English dramatist has long been well known. In 1889 he made a pilgrimage to Stratford which he almost worshipfully reported in an oft-published sketch entitled *La casa de Shakespeare*.<sup>8</sup> Of the 143 works of English literature the late Professor Berkowitz found in Galdós' private library, 38 are Shakespearean titles, more than those of any other author.<sup>9</sup>

*Richard III* enjoyed a huge vogue in Spain from 1835 on for several decades, a vogue surpassed perhaps only by that of *Othello* and rivalled by the popular *Romeo and Juliet*. The vogue included many free arrangements for the stage, to one of which—Bretón's *Los hijos de Eduardo*, a rendering of Casimir Delavigne's French version—Galdós once gave high praise.<sup>10</sup> But the vogue also brought forth a few genuine translations, of which the best, in the judgment of both Juliá and Par was Macpherson's,<sup>11</sup> and this translation was in Galdós' library.<sup>12</sup> One could be pardoned for suspecting that here might be found the source of Galdós' title. But this line of investigation yielded only negative results, for neither this translation nor any other of the several known to Juliá and Par that were available to Galdós before 1907 contains IV, iv. 114 as Galdós quoted it.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> After periodical publication, it appeared in Vol. 51 of Antonio López' Colección Diamante and in Galdós' own miscellany called *Memoranda* (Madrid, 1906), pp. 35-57. In *Memorias* (p. 207) Galdós incorrectly recalls the title as *La patria de Shakespeare*, an error doubtless induced by his own characterization of Stratford in these terms in his opening sentence (*Memoranda*, p. 35).

<sup>9</sup> H. Chonon Berkowitz, *La biblioteca de Benito Pérez Galdós*, El Museo Canario [C. S. I. C.], 1951, numbers 2830-2972. No other author except Dickens (33 titles) comes close.

<sup>10</sup> In *Mendizábal*, ed. Sainz, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 462.

<sup>11</sup> For this and other matters relative to the *Richard III* versions in Spain, see Eduardo Juliá Martínez, *Shakespeare en España* (Madrid, 1918), especially pp. 82-87; and several studies of Alfonso Par: *Contribución a la bibliografía española de Shakespeare* (Barcelona, 1930), pp. 19-20, 43-45, 54, 78-79; *Shakespeare en la literatura española* (Madrid, 1935), Vol. II, pp. 101-108; *Representaciones Shakespearianas en España* (Madrid, 1936), Vol. I, pp. 145-193; II, 8-9.

<sup>12</sup> Berkowitz, *op. cit.*, No. 2954. It is possible to identify this item from annotations Professor Berkowitz made on his *fichas*, which are now in my possession. The *fichas* formed the basis for the published volume, but the annotations were not included.

<sup>13</sup> The *Ricardo III*'s of Antonio Mendoza (Granada, 1850), of Valladares Saavedra y Sánchez Garay (Madrid, 1853), and of Antonio Romero Ortiz (Madrid, 1853), are quite different from Shakespeare's play; none has a Queen Margaret in the cast nor anyone else who makes any speech with a verse even remotely resembling her "Farewell" line. Macpherson translated the verse: "¡Adiós, mujer de York, Reina sombría" (ed. Madrid, 1882, p. 93), and Manuel Hiráldez de Acosta had come closer in prose a few years before with: ". . . ¡Adiós, esposa de York, reina de los infortunios, . . ." (*Teatro selecto antiguo y moderno, nacional y extranjero, coleccionado . . .* por Don



An examination of the historical literature on Isabel II and her reign, however, quickly bore fruit. The creator of the poetic epithet was not at all a notably literary man but the conservative jurist and statesman Antonio Aparisi y Guijarro. In a speech in the Cortes on July 4, 1865, Aparisi opposed the prospective recognition of Victor Emmanuel's new Kingdom of Italy by Isabel II and her government. If Francisco de Nápoles is thus illegally and by an "hecho brutal" deprived of his throne, said Aparisi, the same may well happen soon in Spain, for momentum will be given to a movement already under way in Paris and in Florence to put an end to "la dinastía de los Borbones"; and, he continued, "yo me temo mucho que alguno esté esperando que se haga ese infausto reconocimiento para decir en alta voz aquellas palabras dolorosas de Shakespeare: 'Adios, mujer de Yorck [*sic*], Reina de los tristes destinos.'"<sup>14</sup> Eight years later Aparisi's editor León Galindo y de Vera wrote: "De ayer es aquel discurso que como profético resonó en toda España."<sup>15</sup> The same year a historian of Isabel II's reign, Ildefonso Antonio Bermejo, remembered the speech, although he failed to quote the line.<sup>16</sup> And in our day more than half a century later Pedro de Répide recalls Aparisi as the creator of the well-known "treno jeremíaco."<sup>17</sup>

Now that we know that Galdós got his title, directly or indirectly, from Aparisi, the influence and rôle of Shakespeare is seen to be purely coincidental. The *Episodio* gives no sign that Galdós knew the story of Elizabeth Woodville, Edward IV's Queen, the York's wife of Richard III, either in history or in *Richard III* or in any *Ricardo III* version. He adds nothing to Aparisi's words, merely applying them to his own novelistic situation, as different from the situation of which Aparisi had discoursed as both were from Shakespeare's. But it is, of course, the appropriateness of the epithet that is important, not the lack of analogy in the situations.

It seems relatively unimportant to ask how and by what circum-

Cayetano Vidal y Valenciano, Tomo v [Barcelona, 1868], p. 49a). These comprise all the versions before 1907 recorded by Juliá and Par, and all are held in this country by the incomparable Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, to whose courtesies and rich facilities I am most pleasantly indebted. The Folger also has a Manila, 1883 ed., which has a prose reading of our line identical with that of Hiraldez (p. 387).

<sup>14</sup> Antonio Aparisi y Guijarro, *Obras*, Vol. II (Madrid, 1873), p. 496.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 60.

<sup>16</sup> *La estafeta de Palacio*, Vol. III (Madrid, 1872). [The volume was not really issued until later, for the "carta" here in question is dated October 4, 1873.]

<sup>17</sup> Pedro de Répide, *Isabel II / Reina de España*, in *Vidas españolas e hispanoamericanas del siglo XIX*, Vol. 20 (Madrid, 1932), p. 234; see also p. 276.



stances Aparisi's words came to Galdós. He may have heard them himself in the session of the Cortes, for in those days he was writing for *La Nación*,<sup>18</sup> or he may have picked them up in the press, in café gossip or almost anywhere, so well known and much repeated did they quickly become. In any case, Galdós once revealed that he knew who originated the nickname for the queen, when he wrote in 1912 in his last *Episodio* in the words of his *alter ego* Tito Liviano: "¡Bien haya, Oh tierna Isabel, majestad bondadosa y desdichada, aquel filósofo-político que añadió a tu nombre el lastimero mote de *La de los tristes destinos!*"<sup>19</sup>

As to how Aparisi came by the line, we can only speculate even more hazardingly. Certainly not from any Spanish translation or adaptation of *Richard III* now known to have been available by July 7, 1865. However, a comparison with the text of French versions in the Folger reveals that the Guizot translation, and only this one, contains the significant adjective "tristes," omitted in all other translations, both close and free, in both French and Spanish. Marguerite says: "Adieu, femme d'York, reine des tristes infortunes!"<sup>20</sup> Like every well-educated Spaniard of his day, Aparisi knew French<sup>21</sup> and could have known this translation.<sup>22</sup> If we can accept that he converted "infortunes" to "destinos," his line then becomes a literal translation of Guizot's.

The study of Galdós' title, a small detail which may well be a microcosmic counterpart of one of his wider, more general practices, has led to the conclusion that what at first seemed certain evidence of a direct Shakespearean influence—a quoted translation of a specific verse—is not so at all, is in fact evidence of something quite different. Congenial as the ultimate literary source in Shakespeare and *Richard III* was to Galdós and direct as its influence might have been under other circumstances, his real source for "*La de los tristes destinos*,"

<sup>18</sup> Cf. William H. Shoemaker, "Preliminary Study" to Galdós' *Crónica de la quincena* (Princeton Univ. Press, 1948), p. 18.

<sup>19</sup> *Cánovas* (Madrid, 1912), p. 217. The term "filósofo-político" fits Aparisi appropriately. Galdós had twice referred to Aparisi by name in the *Episodio* that next follows *La de los tristes destinos: España sin rey* (Madrid, 1908), pp. 89, 102.

<sup>20</sup> *Oeuvres complètes de Shakespeare traduction de M. Guizot nouvelle édition entièrement revue . . .*, Vol. VIII (Paris, 1862), p. 99. Luis Astrana Marín's translation ([Madrid, 1921], p. 175) reads the same as Guizot's.

<sup>21</sup> In his famous *Discurso* he quotes a French revolutionary and refers to a French newspaper (see above, n. 13).

<sup>22</sup> Five editions appeared before 1865 and a sixth in that year, all eight volumes of which Galdós, ironically enough, had in his library (Berkowitz, *op. cit.*, numbers 2940-2947).

for all his admiration and even reverence for Shakespeare, was in his local, contemporaneous Madrid environment: a catching phrase in a politician's speech in a session of the Cortes. Galdós could not have used Shakespeare otherwise than thus indirectly any more than he could have introduced Aparisi into a novel ahead of his time or applied the epithet *la de los tristes destinos* to Isabel II before 1865. For Galdós treats history vividly from the standpoint of participants; he immerses himself and his readers in the times and events at hand. From this standpoint the epithet so well known to Galdós and to his contemporaries in 1865 would be inaccurate and inappropriate in the minds and speech of persons, historical or imaginary, living before that year. Retroaction and anachronism of this kind have no place in Galdós' historical thinking or his novelistic method.

University of Kansas

WILLIAM H. SHOEMAKER

## Friedrich Schlegel's *Alarcos* in the Light of His Unpublished Notebooks<sup>1</sup>

*Alarcos* is not an important work, and influence studies rarely repay the labor they involve. The following remarks may, however, serve to illustrate a point the late Josef Körner never tired of repeating, but which seems to have been ignored none the less—that no really fruitful research can be done on Friedrich Schlegel without a knowledge of his unpublished manuscripts.<sup>2</sup> In view of the fact

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on two of Schlegel's unpublished notebooks, *Fragmente zur Litteratur und Poesie* (1797—fall 1798; referred to as Notebook I) and *Fragmente zur Poesie und Litteratur II und Ideen zu Gedichten* (fall 1798—1801; referred to as Notebook III). Josef Körner drew attention to Schlegel's notebooks as early as 1914 (*Literarisches Echo*, XVI, Sp. 949 ff.) and has referred to them in most of his numerous later publications on Schlegel. I was able to examine Schlegel's unpublished manuscripts during a year's research under the auspices of the Nuffield Foundation; a second trip to Europe for the purpose was made possible by a grant from the Humanities Research Committee of Queen's University. To these institutions, I wish to express my sincere thanks.

<sup>2</sup> "Eine Deutung des *Alarcos* wird nun aber durch verschiedene Faktoren wesentlich kompliziert, in erster Linie durch die Tatsache, daß wir von Schlegel selbst aus der Zeit seiner *Alarcos*—Dichtung keine Äußerungen von irgendwelcher Tragweite über seine dramatischen und gedanklichen Intentionen besitzen" (W. Paulsen, "Friedrich Schlegels *Alarcos* und die Umbildung der Frühromantik," *MLN*, LVI (1941), 515). When this statement

that his unpublished notebooks alone amount to several thousand pages in a notoriously difficult handwriting, this conclusion may well be a source of dismay, but it seems inevitable.

Having reminded us that A. W. Schlegel's *Ion* was read to Goethe on October 20, 1801, and performed in Weimar on January 2, 1802, Allen W. Porterfield asserts:

Moved by Wilhelm's success with a dramatic theme from classical antiquity, and by the favor he had won from Goethe, Friedrich Schlegel wrote, with the suddenness for which he was noted in his younger days, *Alarcos. Ein Trauerspiel in zwei Aufzügen*.<sup>3</sup>

Though Porterfield offers no evidence, this assertion has apparently found acceptance.

In his essay, "Friedrich Schlegels *Alarcos* und die Umbildung der Frühromantik," Wolfgang Paulsen suggests that Schlegel's translation of Act I of Racine's *Bajazet* was written in Paris very soon after *Alarcos*, and goes on to claim that the influence of French classical drama makes itself felt in Schlegel's play:

Wenn man den *Alarcos* mit diesem Nachdichtungsversuch zusammenhält, erkennt man, woher Schlegel die antiken Elemente in Wirklichkeit bezogen hat, obwohl man—gerade wegen des vorherrschenden Ehrbegriffs im *Alarcos*—das indirekte Vorbild eher in Corneille als in Racine suchen möchte . . . Klassizistisch—im epigonalen Sinne des Wortes—ist der deklamatorische Ton der Dialogführung, die herkömmliche Metaphorik, wie der völlige Verzicht auf psychologische Begründung . . . Klassizistisch nicht zuletzt ist der ganz casuistische Ehrbegriff, der die äußere Handlung in Gang halten soll.<sup>4</sup>

The mention of *Bajazet* is relevant—and Professor Paulsen's claim in connection with it is plausible—only on the assumption that *Alarcos* was both planned and executed very shortly before its publication in March 1802.<sup>5</sup> This assumption is incorrect. Schlegel seems to have

was published in November, 1941, American scholars had no access to Schlegel's unpublished manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> "The *Alarcos* Theme in German and English," *GR*, VI (1931), 125.

<sup>4</sup> Wolfgang Paulsen, *loc. cit.*, pp. 518 f.

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted, however, that Schlegel's comments on French classicism, both before and after the publication of *Alarcos*, were most unfavorable. Some of his unpublished remarks may be quoted here: "Die französische Tragödie als eine Art von Oper zu betrachten; ohne musikalische Deklamation und orchestrische Gesticulation kann sie nicht leidlich sein" (Notebook I, p. 25; 1797). "Die französische  $\pi$  [Poesie] ist nichts als Repräsentation," (I, 66; 1798). "Die Franzosen des 17ten Jahrhunderts haben grade das schlechteste der spanischen Litteratur nachgeahmt.—Was im *Pelegrino* des *Lope* nicht katholisch ist, ist ungefähr das Zeug zum *Gilblas*, Entführung, Strickleitern, Duelle pp. —" (I, 75; 1798). "Vielleicht existirt keine falsche  $\pi$  als das französische Drama und der engländische Roman" (III, 33;

written most of the play in 1801,<sup>6</sup> but his plan dates back to the fall of 1798. In his notebook *Fragmente zur Poesie und Litteratur II und Ideen zu Gedichten*, a heavily underscored entry, dating from this time, reads:

Alarkos in drei Akten nach der schon construirten Weise—dann noch 2 allegorische vorn und hinten; 5 zusammen.<sup>7</sup>

At this time, Schlegel was pursuing Spanish, not French, studies. On July 27, 1798, he offered to send Tieck an "*epistola critica de novellis hispanis*,"<sup>8</sup> and numerous notebook entries under the heading "Zum spanischen Roman" show that he was preparing himself to live up to his promise.<sup>9</sup> In spite of the heading, most of the entries directly under it refer to the plays of Lope de Vega rather than to Spanish novels. While these references tend to deprecate the playwright, later remarks, dating from 1799, are favorable:

Lope's Lieder fliegen noch zarter hin wie die vom Cervantes. Er ist oft wilder, leichter, bunter, ja sogar tiefer aber immer roher.—

Lope de Vega und Ben Johnson [sic] mögen wohl die größten Virtuosen gewesen sein, die es in der  $\pi$  gegeben hat.—<sup>10</sup>

When Schlegel read Calderon in 1800, his reactions can be gauged from the fact that he associates him with the exponents of Romantic poetry he admires most:

Tasso ein beßrer Racine, Calderon zu den besten.—

Nur die Construirenden gehören zur Kunst, also nur Cervantes und Calderon.

Die moderne  $\pi$  vielleicht bis jetzt Paarweise zu construiren—Dante und Petrarca—Shakspeare und Calderon—Cervantes und Ariosto—Boccacaz und Guarini—Tasso und Camoens.—<sup>11</sup>

1799). "Wie Goethe von den Franzosen, so manche romantische Dichter von den Römern ausgegangen. Beide Nationen nur ein Beweis, daß es große Nationen geben kann ohne Poesie, trotz aller Mühe und Einbildung" (III, 84; end of 1800). Some time after his arrival in Paris, Schlegel still insisted that the French had "kein Talent oder doch nur ein sehr geringes" for music, painting and poetry (*Europa*, I (1803), I. 24).

<sup>6</sup> F. Schlegel's *Briefe an seinen Bruder*, ed. O. Walzel (Berlin, 1890), p. 479; Ludwig Tieck und die Brüder Schlegel, ed. H. Lüdeke (Frankfurt, 1930), p. 101; *Aus Schleiermachers Leben*, ed. L. Jonas and W. Dilthey (Berlin, 1858 ff.), Vol. III, p. 295.

<sup>7</sup> Notebook III, p. 13. There is compelling internal evidence that this notebook was started in the fall of 1798, and the beginning of the year 1799 is noted on p. 19.

<sup>8</sup> Ludwig Tieck und die Brüder Schlegel, ed. cit., p. 41.

<sup>9</sup> Notebook I, pp. 75 f.

<sup>10</sup> notebook III, pp. 20, 35.  $\pi$  = Poesie.

<sup>11</sup> Notebook III, pp. 83, 85, 86.

All this bears out what is in any case suggested by the verse forms employed in the play and by the original source of its plot—i. e., that the foreign influences that helped to shape *Alarcos* were not French but Spanish. As for the “casuistische Ehrbegriff” in the play, which Professor Paulsen would ascribe to French models, Schlegel’s notebooks leave no doubt that he had it from Spain:

Die Spanier haben die **conventionellen** Leidenschaften (Ehre etc.) zuerst gut dargestellt.<sup>12</sup>

*Lope’s* Drama ganz berechnet auf die Convention der *Cortezanos*—point d’honneur das ‘ερ και πᾶν.<sup>13</sup>

These remarks lead up to a note from 1800 that points to the central theme of *Alarcos*:

In der Tragödie muß wohl alles auf Ehre beruhen.<sup>14</sup>

Queen’s University

HANS EICHNER

## REVIEWS

William P. Albrecht, *The Loathly Lady in “Thomas of Erceldoune”*: *With a Text of the Poem Printed in 1652* (Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1954. 127 pp. \$1.00. Univ. of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, 11). THE most elaborate edition of Thomas of Erceldoune (or Thomas the Rhymer, as he is perhaps more commonly known) is that of James A. H. Murray, published for the EETS in 1875. It reproduces the five manuscripts of the poem (*Thomas of Ersseldoune*) and provides an elaborate introduction, which, in addition to purely textual matters, is largely devoted to Thomas’s supposed biography, his prophecies, and their relation to other prophetic writings of the period. Of almost equal importance is Alois Brandl’s reconstructed version based on the Thornton MS, the oldest and most accurate text of the poem. This edition appeared in 1880 as the second volume of the *Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben*. Now, three quarters of a century later, Albrecht’s study supplements these editions in two

<sup>12</sup> Notebook I, p. 76 (1798).

<sup>13</sup> Notebook III, p. 31 (1799).

<sup>14</sup> Notebook III, p. 71.

significant ways: it provides a careful analysis of the Loathly Lady motif, and it makes available again the heretofore unedited seventeenth-century printing of the poem, which is to be found in *Sundry Strange Prophecies of Merlin, Bede, Becket, and Others* (London, 1652) under the title, "The Prophecies of Sir Thomas of Asteldowne." It is important not only because it is the first printed edition of the poem but also because it presents a text differing from any contained in the five known manuscripts; hence it is of primary significance in any study of the poem and especially in any attempt to reconstruct the original text. It is closest to the Sloane MS, the second-best manuscript.

Useful though it is to have this sixth text of the poem readily available in a modern reprint, the average scholar is likely to be more interested in the discussion of the Loathly Lady in the chapters headed "The Fairy Mistress," "The Transformed Animal," "The Sovereignty," "The Shepherd's Daughter," and "The Good and Bad Fairy." The lady's behavior is perplexing. On first seeing her, the poet, so moved by her heaven-like beauty, is certain that she is the Blessed Virgin, but she almost abruptly disabuses him of this notion and, though counseling morality, loses no time when he asks her to lie with him—indeed, she accommodates him some seven times in the course of the day. The result of such behavior is her transformation from beauty to ugliness. She forces him to accompany her on an unpleasant journey but rewards him for going. When he asks her to tell him some "far lye" (also *for lie, farlye*, i. e., "wonder"), she is reluctant to do so but again bows to his will and recites the prophecies which constitute the second and third fyttes. This contradictory behavior is explained as resulting from the author's use of a Cupid and Psyche story with fairy mistress additions. "The exact form of the story as the poet found it cannot be determined. The lack of any very close analogue would suggest some freedom and originality of treatment, but probably the main outline of the story was already established" (69-70).

There are many medieval narratives in which the transformation from beauty to ugliness and the reverse takes place. The *Wife of Bath's Tale* is the most noteworthy of these, but one need only call to mind such obvious titles as *The Marriage of Gawain*, *The Weddyng of Sir Gawen and Dame Ragnell*, *Gower's Tale of Florent*, and *The Auntyrs of Arthure at the Terne Wathelyne* to be reminded sharply of the popularity of the Loathly Lady theme in medieval writing.



It may be mentioned that the language of this 1652 version of the poem has been modernized (i. e., by its early editor) but that it still presents a good number of difficulties. These are largely disposed of in Albrecht's sixteen pages of textual notes, his glossary, and the index to proper names. The seven-page bibliography and a good index complete this study, one of which both the author and the University of New Mexico Press may be justly proud.

Louisiana State University

THOMAS A. KIRBY

E. V. Gordon (ed.), *Pearl* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. 1x + 167 pp.). THIS edition of *Pearl* comes opportunely. Thirty-three years have passed since the appearance of the last one,<sup>1</sup> and a new one must take cognizance of the mass of scholarship that has mounted up within those years.

The book is largely the work of the late Professor E. V. Gordon, who did not live to see it in its present form. The task of bringing out the book fell to Mrs. Gordon, who discharged that pious duty under difficulties with competency.

An idea of what those difficulties were is given in the Preface. In 1950 the publisher insisted on reducing the size of the volume. Doing so in a way that preserved as much as possible of original material necessitated much rewriting. Mrs. Gordon admits some sacrifice of such material in the Introduction particularly. One can detect considerable paring down in the Notes, which discuss at any length only those hard knots that require discussion.

Still the text does carry the necessary critical apparatus. The Introduction deals succinctly, if somewhat curtly, with the Manuscript, the author (as far as we can know him), the form and purpose of the poem, its symbolism and doctrinal theme, its sources and analogues, and the literary traditions to be found within it; its verse-medium, date, dialect and vocabulary. Textual notes display the suggestions or emendations of previous commentators more completely than earlier editions, and the explanatory notes seem eminently sound and sensible. Discussion of the details of metre, spelling, phonology, accident and the influence of Scandinavian and of O. F. speech upon

<sup>1</sup> I purposely pass over the handy little Bowdoin edition of 1932, which prints a text of the poem, but (quite understandably) carries little in the way of critical apparatus nor attempts much in the way of an evaluation of the poem.

the phonology and vocabulary of *Pearl* has been relegated to Appendices.<sup>2</sup> A Glossary bears witness to the editors' etymological competence and scholarly care. An Index of Proper Names and a list of definite (not inferential) Biblical quotations and allusions complete the book.

It is a fact most significant for all students of ME. that Professor Gordon, even after the appearance of much that has been written since 1921 (the date of Gollancz's last edition) still holds firmly the belief that the author of *Pearl* laments the death of one whom he once loved, and still loves. He takes the poet at his own words which are certainly definite:

- (1) To þenke hir color so clad in clot (22).
- (2) I knew hyr wel, I hade sen hyr ere (164).
- (3) Lest ho me eschaped þat I þer chos,  
Er I at steuen hir moȝt stalle (187-8).
- (4) Ho watȝ me nerre þen aunte or nece (233).
- (5) We meten so selden by stok oper ston (380).

If these lines authenticate the loss, not of a state of grace, but of a human person, even more precise are 483-5:

þou lyfed not two ȝer in oure þede;  
þou cowþeȝ never God nauþer plesse ne pray,  
Ne neuer nauþer Pater ne Crede.

The unknown departed was indeed an "innocent." She had never been indoctrinated in the rudiments of the Christian faith, and could, therefore, never have incurred sin by neglecting or transgressing them. To say that the author may have intended to depict the very elementary knowledge and scanty experience of a young religious by the statement above is "expressing this strongly if we represent him as knowing neither Pater nor Creed."<sup>3</sup> The poem deals wholly and solely with the innocence of uninstructed little children.<sup>4</sup> What interest the "innocence" of mature persons had for our poet can never be discovered, for it does not exist in this poem he wrote. Lines

<sup>2</sup> I cannot agree with the statement of one reviewer that "in the appendix on metre the alliterative element is emphasized to a degree which some scholars may think extreme." Actually only one paragraph of 12 lines is devoted to "the alliterative element."

<sup>3</sup> "A New Interpretation of *Pearl*," *The Month* 147. 546.

<sup>4</sup> In *St. Erkenwald*, New Haven, Conn., 1926, p. 78, note 9, I have made the point that the poet was interested in the ultimate salvation of (1) the unbaptized righteous, and (2) baptized infants. It is the first class that he expatiates on in *St. Erkenwald*; the second class in *Pearl*.

617 ff. and 661 ff. make it quite clear that mature persons are under a dispensation that is not discussed in this poem.

Throughout the entire poem the poet's interest lies with the baptized innocents, their earthly and heavenly states. He displays this interest through the symbolism of the pearl, so that on the main theme there falls the illumination which the stone reflects. The editors have imagination enough to sense that without this shifting symbolic accompaniment the poem would be too brutally curt to attract sensitive minds, but they have too much discrimination not to see that the symbolic accompaniment merely emphasizes the main theme, and they refuse to twist and torture the poem into what they would like to see it mean.

Attempts to allegorize new meanings out of a medieval narrative are somewhat prevalent at the present time. In such attempts there are real dangers. One who indulges his bent for analogizing tends to forget that medieval literature is not necessarily medieval theology, and that it does not attain clarity or speak with its own voice when it is interpreted in terms of the latter. Furthermore, in order to make the analogy between the story and the ethical or theological meaning one fancies in it the analogist must at times support his equation by citations from codices or manuscripts compiled in Germany, Italy or France which the author could not have seen. By this means the poem can be given a slant that the author never intended it to have. Professor and Mrs. Gordon, as practised and well-trained scholars, are aware of such dangers and do not attempt to stretch the poet's words to unwarrantable implications.

The text is, as it should be, quite conservative—and a conservative text of *Pearl* is indeed a desiderium. Many commentators seem to have thrown away the canons of good editorship when they have approached *Pearl*. The rule that what an author (or scribe) wrote down in a unique medieval manuscript is not to be changed without overwhelming evidence against leaving it as it stands, seems to have been forgotten when a scholar sat down before this poem. Professor Emerson informs us that "it should be our purpose to restore these poems to their original form, so far as that may have been disturbed by an unreliable copyist, and with such light as a knowledge of the language of the time may throw upon the poet's probable accuracy,"<sup>5</sup> and in pursuance of that declaration proceeds to "tag" a large number of words with -e. Mrs. Gordon has shown us (pp. 106-9), and it is to

<sup>5</sup> *PMLA*, 37. 61.

our shame that we needed to be shown, that any editor who adds to or deletes from a word in the text of *Gawain* or *Pearl* an *-e*, is treading upon dangerous ground. In this author *-e* often appears in the spelling of a word in which it was not sounded; in some of these instances it cannot be proved that the poet resorted to elision. Apparently he had a choice of pronunciation with or without *-e*. In other instances *-e* may have been sounded in a word where it was not written.

In the following instances the Gordons could have shown themselves even more conservative. In the case of the following the manuscript reading could have been allowed to stand.

35 *spryngande*, ms. *sprygande* (see *NED. sprig*, v. 2); 54 *fyrce*, ms. *fyrt* (OE. *fyrht*); 89 *flowen*, ms. *flozen*; 197 *beau biys*, ms. *beau uiys* ("beauteous appearances"); 302 *leuez* for ms. *louez* seems an attempt for "perfectionism," when one remembers the poet's fondness for *e-o* variation, see also the instance in 308; 353 *stynt*, ms. *stynst* (a correct form for imperative singular); 572 *called*, ms. *calle*, cf. past part. *endente* 629; 698 *sy3* for ms. *sez* is unnecessary if the latter form is allowed to stand in 302; 817 addition of *In* is unnecessary; 829 *swete*, ms. *swatte* ("underwent severe affliction"); 935 *byggynge3* ms. *lygynge3* (*lyg(g)yng*e, "place where one lies"); 1097 *enpryse*, ms. *enpresse*, no need for emendation since ms. form is cited as a variant of *emprise*, *NED*, sb., obsol. 3; 1196 *mozte*, ms. *mozten*.

As to the explanatory notes I have the feeling that those Professor Gordon wrote must have been pretty rigorously cut. One misses the alliterative parallelisms from other poems of the school, and the texts from patristic authors that support the poet's theological utterances. Those that remain uncut, however, are excellent. They say no more than is necessary, are the result of logical and clear-headed thinking, and are lacking in all *Tendenz*. Their authors' concern is to place the requisite information before the reader, suggest that he weigh the several possible solutions, and refrain from the attempt to force on him any one of them, whose validity is made to appear all the stronger by reason of the suppression of arguments that tell against it.

So written, the notes need little comment. I would, however, animadvert upon the following.

In an able review of this edition Professor Marie Hamilton, remarking upon the lines 13-14, declares that there is no basis in the text for the assumption that the bereaved author watched beside the maiden's "grave." Now while it is true that the poet does not expressly declare that he fell asleep on a grave mound, one cannot help

feeling that Mrs. Hamilton's assertion fails to take into account the *pros* which counter her *cons*. The poet tells us that on the spot where the pearl "trendeled down" there were gilly-flowers, ginger and gromwell growing, which evokes the picture suggested by Gordon's derivation from dial. Lances. *hile*, "a thick clump of plants," i. e., a grave mound with flowers planted on it (custom not unknown today). Mrs. Hamilton does not credit the poet with much imagination when she declared that *hyl* in the poem renders Vulgate *Mons* (actually of four occurrences I can find only one case where it does so). The sense-stretching capacity of a word in the hands of the *Pearl*-poet is remarkable. He is no more tied by a word from the Vulgate to one sole English nuance than Shakespeare: see *E. D. D.*, *hill*, sb. The poet never refrained from the use of a word now classed as dialectal whenever he chose to employ it. In short, the reader cannot help feeling that the spot on which the poet lay, the hill where the flowers bloomed (57), is the grave mound. By every device, short of legal affidavit, the poet is trying to tell us so. In 383, the line

Crystes mersy and Mary and Jon

refers to the rood on its screen in the parish Church, with the figures of Mary and John on either side of it. The emendation of 529 from *At the day of date of euensonge* to *At the date of day of euensonge* is unnecessary. The line makes sense as written: "At [in] the day at the time of evensong," i. e., while still day, one hour before evensong.

The glossary is generally sound in its definitions and derivations. I have the feeling that here, as in the explanatory notes, the publisher preached economy. To give only one definition for an entry, as this edition too frequently does, deprives the reader of nuances which the author may have wished us to catch.

The following meanings have been selected from previous commentators (especially Mrs. Joseph Wright and the Professor O. F. Emerson) as more appropriate than those given.

*agrete* 560, "for the particular job." *among* 905, "in your company, beside you." *baysment* 174, "sense of inferiority." *cleuen* 66, not "clove the air," but "forked out, separated." *clos* 183, gloss as sb.: "so fair for a perfect setting in gold." *daily* 313, Emerson suggests two meanings of ON *deila*, "discern, distinguish," which seem best here to hit off the poet's meaning. *feste* 283. A crux. Morris and Osgood note rime in—*este* and gloss "feast," Emerson

points out that *feste* is the usual form in these poems for "fast," and glosses "make fast." The reader may take his choice. *flake* 947, Osgood's der. from Icl. *flake*, "sheep-pen" has not been driven out of court; as God's castle is without moat, so is his flock unfolded and free to wander. *gete* 95, deriv. from ON. *gāta*, "watch, heed, tell of," instead of "get" is worth consideration. *menske* 162, "rank" is here more accurate than "courtesy." *reparde* 611. Emerson's deriv. from OF. *respardir*, "divide" would seem more likely than that from OF. *parre*, "enclose." *spenned* 49, 53; ON. *spenna* has both the meanings "span" and "clasp." In 49, as Mrs. Wright notes, "span, stretch," is the sense required; in 53 "clasp," as also in *Gaw.* 158. *wale*, 1000, 1007. Emerson suggests deriv. not from Icl. *velja*, but from Me *wālen*. *wope* 151, 375 is plainly not "peril" (ON *váði*), but "path" (OE. *wāþ*). *wrahte* 56. No need to derive from OE *wyrcan*, since it is a known variant of pa. t. of that verbe, *worhte*.

It is no slur on previous editions and editors of *Pearl* to say that the present one, despite condensations and excisions, is to date the best. Such it is long likely to remain. Nor do I fear that the editors' quiet statement on page xii, 'there are a number of precise details in *Pearl* that cannot be subordinated to any general allegorical interpretation,' is likely to be refuted now or later.

Princeton University

H. L. SAVAGE

William B. Ewald, *The Masks of Jonathan Swift* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. 203 pp. \$4.50). MR. Ewald's book, which consists of a chapter comparing Swift's use of *personae* with the use made by writers from the 20th century to the 17th, followed by chapters dealing chronologically with the various masks assumed by Swift, makes one point well, indeed exhaustively: it is essential to distinguish Swift's attitudes from those of his *personae*. By carefully assembling the evidence that Swift consciously differentiated himself from Bickerstaff, the Drapier, and Gulliver, Ewald proves satisfactorily that we misread Swift's works if we simply consider the *personae* instruments for self-expression and identify Swift with his characters. Ewald is not, however, quite able to relinquish the belief that the masks somehow reflect "facets of the character of the complex man" (p. 189); Swift, he says in a revealingly equivocal sentence, must be considered "not only among Yeats, Wilde, and other *fin-de-siècle*



writers, but rather among the much larger number of impersonators and creators of characters who were not trying to fuse their identity with that of their *personae*" (p. 10). Ewald does not, of course, simply equate Swift and his characters, but his desire to find Swift's feelings and opinions in the works is reflected in references to Swift's "corrosive intellectuality," "biting hatreds," and "mordant indignation," clichés which are supported neither by biographical nor literary evidence. And when Ewald offers his alternative to conventional oversimplifications of Swift's works, it turns out to be another kind of oversimplification; instead of finding the personality or attitudes of Swift in the masks, he looks for Swift's "real message" behind the masks and finds truisms. Swift thought that Europeans should publish less and better books (p. 187) or Swift appealed to permanent values—"the belief, for example, that fraud, war, and madness are bad and that truthfulness, reason, and humility are good" (p. 188).

Because he assumes that Swift conceals a simple and general "true meaning" behind the false and exaggerated statements of his characters, Ewald fails to consider that the characters' comments not only conceal the meaning of Swift's works but reveal it, that it is by means of the details of *A Tale of a Tub* or *Gulliver's Travels* that Swift defines and gives precise application to his general meaning and that he persuades the reader to accept normal and positive attitudes. In his second chapter, for example, Ewald discusses the parody of the "moderns" in the *Tale* and finds that the long comparison, in the "Introduction," of wisdom to a fox, a cheese, and finally a nut, is a "mere illogical comparison which conceals no second meaning" (p. 19). Surely the comparison is not only a parody of modern writing but, in the context, helps to define the faults of such writing and persuades the reader to look below the surface and choose "with judgment." Ewald points out in his third chapter that Swift disagrees radically with the Tale-Teller's statements but he does not tell us, except in very general terms, what the positive meaning or the structure of the *Tale* is; he does not attempt to discuss the work as a unified whole in which the details contribute to the development of a complex meaning. As a result of his assumption, then, Ewald's interpretations of passages and works are at best limited and tentative. They are also conciliatory; in his discussion of *A Project for the Advancement of Religion*, Ewald shows clearly that Swift undercuts the projector's system, yet he is unwilling to quarrel with established opinion and

therefore concludes only that one "suspects that Swift could not have had entire faith" in the projector's scheme (p. 46).

It may be unfair to ask that Mr. Ewald not only remove obstacles to the reading of Swift's works but assist us in reading more accurately. It seems to me, however, that interpretation of Swift's works is the logical and desirable end of Ewald's subject and method and that by not advancing farther towards that end he not only fails to make the most of his subject but confuses, rather than clarifying, the relationship between biography, history, and criticism. The King of Brobdingnag, he says, "reflects in an extreme form some of Swift's most pessimistic feelings in his conclusions about England," but it is not, he adds, Swift's considered opinion that men are odious vermin. Where do we go from here? To Swift's letters and his other works and to English history, in order to find out what Swift's considered opinions were and whether they were justified, or to the context of the third voyage, in order to discover what Swift said about man and society? In coming to conclusions about the significance of the Houyhnhnms, are we to look for Swift's attitude (if we are, biographical and historical evidence is needed) or are we to test the Houyhnhnms "by the standards of imperfect human life," as Ewald says we should not (p. 161)? Is Gulliver both Houyhnhnm and Yahoo, as Ewald suggests, or is he, as I think, neither? Here, both literary evidence and historical and biographical evidence as to what Swift and his contemporaries meant by "reason" would seem to be relevant. Because his answer to complicated questions of interpretation—we must look for Swift's satiric message—is too easy and too vague, Ewald stops short of the kind of interpretation that is implicit in his subject and method: interpretation depending primarily upon careful reading of the texts but making use of relevant historical and biographical information. Ewald has, however, taken a large step in the direction of a better reading of Swift.

*Indiana University  
Fort Wayne*

H. D. KELLING

James L. Clifford, *Young Sam Johnson* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955. xv + 377 pp. \$5.75. Illustrated). THIS is a sound book. Professor Clifford's modesty of aim (p. vii), his disavowal of claims to great originality (ix), and his desire to speak to the audience reached by Boswell's journals—the publisher is the same and the book

is apparently considered as in some ways a part of the series—should not keep this book out of the hands of the serious scholar and his pupils. New light is shed on some of the darkest corners of Johnson's life, even though not as much as the Johnsonian may sometimes have wished. Some information is minute—Johnson's eyes *were* gray (111), there *was* ice on the Christ Church meadow in November of 1728 (112)—but this is as it should be in a thorough biography, not least in the biography of a man who himself required of the biographer attention to just such minutiae. Other facts significantly alter the traditional view of the young Johnson. He was not, for example, desperately poor at Oxford, at least not at first (114-115). Legend, thanks in part to Garrick's peeping, has made of Johnson's bride an unbelievable grotesque. Mr. Clifford has shown that when Johnson brought "Widow Porter" to the altar she was a handsome, spirited, and sensible woman (152-153). But the Tetty of later years Mr. Clifford removes from the legend of Johnson's and Boswell's sentiment, presenting her as a nagging, ailing, and drinking woman. The frictions and frustrations of that period may have profoundly influenced Johnson's later years (310 ff.).

Mr. Clifford's information has been garnered from many quarters. He has availed himself of the best research on Johnson, both published and unpublished; and he should be commended for having put good doctoral dissertations to the use for which they were intended but which all too often they fail to receive. Mr. Clifford has also skilfully reconstructed political and social backgrounds. His discussion of what it meant to be a Tory or a Whig in Michael Johnson's Lichfield (39 ff.); his assessment of Johnson's position in the Walmesley circle, where the young man very early developed his familiar distrust of easy political experimentation (104 ff.); his relating Johnson's early London years to the insatiable appetite for biography characteristic of the 1740's and to the melancholy mood of England in that period (249-250; 318); his perceptive analysis of *London* as a disillusioned but a youthfully and impetuously disillusioned poem (a view much sounder than that of Professor Krutch, who found in the poem an unJohnsonian kind of primitivism)—these and other passages like them are expertly done. They are not always equalled, but the level is high and the insights are shrewd, cautious, and sound.

Not the least merit of *Young Sam Johnson*—and this cannot be said of all scholarly biographies—is that it stimulates thought. The

discussion, for example, of Johnson's early verse, based on verse exercises now at Yale and poems in the Hyde collection, provides information for new insights about Johnson's development as a poet (91 ff.). The parallel with Smart is just. But reading the juvenile verses on St. Simon and St. Jude, one wonders if Johnson may not also have resembled Swift. Did he, too, undergo a period of "Pindarick madness"? Did he, like Swift, radically and consciously change his poetical program? "Where doth extatick fury move/My rude unpolish'd song," wrote Johnson at seventeen. The lines not only reveal a "deep religious capacity" (92); they also demonstrate a commitment to a kind of poetry Johnson was later to disapprove of. Religious ecstasy, he was later to believe, was inappropriate for verse. Religious himself, he disliked religious verse. Why?

On the subject of Johnson's immorality in the early London years, Mr. Clifford is cautious, perhaps too cautious. Citing evidence of the couple's frequent and lengthy separations, of Tetty's coldness and unavailability, of her husband's endearing familiarities with Mrs. Desmoulins, Mr. Clifford, in the absence of clear evidence, rejects Hawkins's imputation of infidelity. He interprets Johnson's admissions of guilt and his constant self-censure for "sensuality" and "corrupt desires" as being repentance for having too strenuously insisted on his conjugal rights and for having been guilty of excessive lust in marriage (314-316). But such an attitude seems singularly unJohnsonian. Though a man of scruples, he did not often blame himself for aggressiveness toward anyone—in fact, in this matter he was usually somewhat obtuse—and one wonders if he would have censured his own demonstrations of affection, even though they were somewhat importunate. In spite of the lack of evidence, it is more plausible to believe that Johnson's strong passions, unsatisfied by Tetty's fretful ill health and their long separations, led to infidelity. If true, that fact would fully account for Johnson's morbid preoccupation with his sin (for so he would have necessarily regarded it) and also for the sentimental tenderness with which he grieved his ill and wronged wife.

But in reading *Young Sam Johnson* one is seldom disposed to quarrel or quibble. One of its eminent qualities is the good judgment everywhere displayed.

Northwestern University

JEAN H. HAGSTRUM

**Charles Norton Coe, *Wordsworth and the Literature of Travel* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1953. 122 pp. \$3.00).** PROFESSOR Coe has presented an interesting and scholarly analysis of Wordsworth's indebtedness to travel books of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Such books include accounts of tours in Great Britain as well as of travels in Europe and America. For documentary evidence of Wordsworth's drawing upon these books Mr. Coe refers to the poems and letters of the poet.

The most important chapters in Mr. Coe's study are those devoted to "Travel Books and Wordsworth's Theory of Poetry," and "Travel Books and Wordsworth's Interest in Primitivism." These are significant topics. By way of contrast, it is unfortunate that Mr. Coe felt the need to stress so much the fact that Wordsworth was a reader. The poet's letters reveal this time and time again.

Mr. Coe's main arguments are conveniently presented in his excellent "Summary": 'that the poet's indebtedness to travel books can be traced from his earliest to his latest poems'; 'that travel books furnished him with incidents and characters as well as assisting him in his imagery'; 'that his use of them reveals he did not always compose extemporaneously while out walking'; 'and that many of his favorite themes parallel those of the travel books.' These arguments, like Mr. Coe's book as a whole, are likely to be of more interest to the specialist than to the general student of Wordsworth.

Mr. Coe's study is scrupulously presented with a full Appendix showing the relation of specific poems to specific travel books. There is also a useful bibliography and a convenient index.

*Princeton University*

GILBERT DUNKLIN

**Geoffrey Tillotson, *Thackeray the Novelist* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954. xv + 312 pp. \$4.00).** THIS study is a significant contribution to a just appreciation of Thackeray. Eschewing biography or biographical criticism, it concentrates on the novelist's writings. While it may disappoint anyone expecting ingenious insights or rigorous analysis of individual novels, it supplies a valuable general appraisal of Thackeray's distinctive qualities. Essentially a lucid and urbane essay by a critic acknowledging partiality but avoiding both dogmatism and lyricism, the book takes for its theme the "oneness" of Thackeray—that, as Saintsbury says, "he is all of a piece." Although some readers may be annoyed by the frequency and

length of extracts from Thackeray's works set in small type, this is not a book to be dipped into or skimmed. Except for two appendices (one seeking to minimize Thackeray's mother in his conception of Helen Pendennis, the other to indicate his place in the "great tradition," as a forerunner of George Eliot and Henry James), the volume must be read consecutively and entire. Those who survive trial by fine print will find it provocative and rewarding.

Among characteristics contributing to Thackeray's oneness, Professor Tillotson refers to the recurrence of characters from novel to novel, the panoramic unity of time and place, the flowing continuity rather than design of the six long novels (the primary sources for this study), the distinguished prose style, the masks as narrator persistently assumed by the novelist, and other less obvious qualities, such as narration by stream of experience, bordering on stream of consciousness, the delayed completion "of what is to be said of a thing," consistent pungency of phrasing, and customary imagery. To his remarks on imagery, Professor Tillotson might have added an allusion to the skill with which Thackeray suggests character through recurrent images—for example, through those of the spider and of Delilah applied to Becky Sharp.

An important aspect of Professor Tillotson's essay lies in his defense of Thackeray's passages of commentary against Mr. Percy Lubbock's charge of obtrusion. For a novelist who writes as a self-styled historian, Professor Tillotson believes the commentary not only legitimate but conducive to the illusion of reality which the author seeks to create. Demonstrating that Thackeray is never strictly "scenic" in Mr. Lubbock's sense of the word, and that the novels are actually a tissue of narrative with criticism and criticism with narrative, he maintains that the reader experiences no jarring sense of the author's intrusion even with extended passages of commentary. In addition, he sees the commentary as providing smooth transitions between incidents or dialogue and "a certain variety of style." To the commentary he attributes much of the effectiveness of Thackeray's books. While his argument will not persuade everybody, it is a salutary rejoinder to what has become a critical cliché.

On Thackeray's "truthfulness," including his view of character and fate, Professor Tillotson is illuminating. On the author's "philosophy," though usually cogent, he is perhaps less satisfying. Despite his own and Thackeray's warnings against taking as the author's, opinions expressed by a character in a story, he accepts as Thackeray's,



Pen's position on society in his debate with Warrington (*Pendennis*, chapter XXIII). Yet later, when he quotes the remainder of this debate, he concludes, "Who can say for certain where the author himself stands?" As Thackeray says in the quoted extract, such cynical reasoning as Pen's can lead only to selfishness and isolation, from which, it is evident, love alone can save. In the fight for truth alluded to in the passage, there seems to be no question of Thackeray's standing aloof. If Thackeray, like Dickens, is no revolutionary, he too is a reformer. If he would not, as Professor Tillotson declares, change the structure of society, like Dickens he would change men's attitudes toward each other.

By concluding on a note of autumnal glow, Professor Tillotson does not seem quite to have done justice to Thackeray's fundamental vitality; nor, perhaps, does he make sufficient claim for Thackeray as a craftsman. One could wish, for instance, that his discussion had included such elements of Thackeray's art as his various techniques of irony and his subtle manipulation of suspense.

Whatever exception one may take to certain features, the book enlarges our perspective and offers a fresh estimate of a novelist eminently deserving the attention and respect of modern critics. This work provides a major step toward the goal Professor Tillotson modestly envisions, "As Thackeray's writings come to be studied more closely, views will be tested and will shed their crudeness, coming to rest on a subtler justice, which lacking a sufficiency of worthy criticism, we cannot yet discern."

Harvard University

EDGAR F. SHANNON, JR.

Clyde H. Cantrell and Walton R. Patrick, comp., *Southern Literary Culture: A Bibliography of Masters' and Doctors' Theses* (Tuscaloosa: Univ. of Alabama Press, 1955. xiv + 124 pp.). THE increasing number of those interested in Southern literature and cultural history will welcome this basic tool for further research. The compilers have been indefatigable in their efforts to be thorough and accurate in their listing of all theses completed in this field down through 1948. Though they modestly disclaim definitiveness for their bibliography, it is doubtful that many additions or corrections will be made to their total of 2529 items. In the categories of individual authors, language, folklore, and bibliographies there were few problems. In that of cultural history, confessedly broad, the compilers

have properly decided to err on the side of inconclusiveness; and the same is true regarding geographical coverage which has been extended to the border states. There have been included in the survey all institutions doing graduate work in the appropriate fields, related departments in the humanities and social sciences, and theses only partially pertinent to the subject as well as those wholly so.

The impressiveness of the bulk of research here indicated is considerably reduced when one points out that more than two thousand of the 2529 items listed are Masters' theses. Not many such studies contain genuine contributions to knowledge, and fewer still are of real critical value, but occasional ones are useful in supplying bibliographical and biographical information, especially on minor authors and neglected areas. Dissertations are of higher though quite uneven quality, as everyone knows. But it is good to have them all listed, and the discerning scholar can find his way to the really valuable ones, frequently by the title and the compilers' helpful annotations. A twenty-five page index groups them under individual authors and subjects; in spite of the wide variety of the latter, however, the categories are inadequate. (E. g., under "Humor" one does not find the references to Longstreet, et al., but must know and consult the names of the individual humorists; under "Frontier" he does not find item 69, on frontier language, etc.).

Looked at statistically, the research so far completed in Southern literary culture is perhaps more appalling than reassuring. One is not surprised to find that Poe leads the field, but the total of 272 items relating to him comprises more that is trivial or misdirected than what is significant. If Faulkner tallies 45, Paul Green has 58. And in the older period, for 22 dealing with a poet of the calibre of Timrod, there are 67 on the author of "Uncle Remus." Such a master of the short story as Katherine Anne Porter has attracted only two (both MA theses)—the same number as Dorothy Dix. Directors of research, take heed! Possibly the greatest value of this list will be to make us repentant of past sins and resolved to amend our ways in the future. But these are not the sins of the compilers, who are on the contrary to be thanked for their revelations as well as for their useful tool.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

Stanley M. Vogel, *German Literary Influences on the American Transcendentalists* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1955. xvii + 196 pp. \$4.00. Yale Studies in English, 127). THIS volume compresses within approximately two hundred pages more essential information regarding the leading New England Transcendentalists' knowledge of German literature and thought than one can find in any other book twice its size. This factual and often detailed information is set forth in an ordered and lucid manner—no mean achievement considering the minutiae involved. I appreciate Professor Vogel's success in this respect all the more because in my own book on German cultural influence in America (now in page proof) I encountered many of the same problems of organizing and condensing (sometimes of much the same or similar materials), and I wish I could feel that I had done as well as he.

One observation I would make of Mr. Vogel's organization is that Part I, entitled "German Scholarship Outside of the Transcendental Circle," comprising the first sixty pages, might have been eliminated in favor of more space for Part II: "German Scholarship Among the Transcendentalists," pp. 61-156. The subjects treated in Part I include (1) "The Nature of German Literature in New England before 1800," (2) "The Trend toward Favorable Criticism," e. g., in the periodicals, (3) "New England Scholars and the Study of German," i. e., the roles of men like William Bentley, J. Q. Adams, Moses Stuart, James Marsh, Ticknor, Everett, Bancroft, Cogswell, Motley, William Emerson, and George Calvert, and (4) "German Instructors in New England," including Charles Follen, Francis Lieber, Carl Beck, and Herman Bokum. While the author adds many hitherto unknown and often interesting details, the whole represents ground already fairly covered by earlier investigators; and since he does not demonstrate or illustrate precisely how and where the work of these precursors prepared the way for the Transcendentalists' interest in German literature and thought, the relevance of Part I to Part II may be questioned. This connection *can* be demonstrated. The point is that Mr. Vogel has not done it. Each of the subjects treated in Part I is a legitimate subject of inquiry in its own right; but Mr. Vogel admittedly introduces the first part merely as background, and then fails to establish its relation to the foreground.

In the second part Professor Vogel's grouping and general handling of the major Transcendentalists' concern with German writers is both skillful and effective. He presents (1) The Men of Letters:

Emerson, Thoreau, and Alcott, (2) the Theologians: Channing (the elder), Ripley, Hedge, and Parker; (3) the Critics: J. F. Clarke and Margaret Fuller, and (4) the Translators: J. S. Dwight and C. T. Brooks. This arrangement affords some insight into the matter of what German literature meant to the several groups or segments. What does not appear clearly is how, individually or collectively, they were *influenced by* the German writers whom they studied so intently. A more accurate or fitting title for the book would have been "The American Transcendentalists' Knowledge of German Literature." Except in the case of Emerson, we learn little about which ideas they adopted or adapted from which Germans, or in what respects their literary techniques were modified by their study of German authors. Even in the case of Emerson, we do not come to grips with precise instances of influence. Mr. Vogel contends that however pervasive Emerson's interest in German thought was, its effect was vague and evanescent: "I side with those persons who believe that much in Emerson's thought and philosophy which may appear German is merely Yankee" (p. 103). The meager evidence offered in support of this judgment I find unconvincing. For example, my count of the number of references that Emerson makes in his journals to Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel differs markedly upwards from Mr. Vogel's; and when we add the references that Emerson made in the portions of his still unpublished journals and in his letters (which surely cannot be disregarded), the difference in our counts is multiplied. One wishes that instead of merely citing or quoting C. P. Cranch, O. B. Frothingham, E. E. Hale, P. E. More, Hedi Hildebrand, and Friedrich Linz (pp. 104-106) as substantiating his contention, Mr. Vogel himself had systematically traced Emerson's prolonged wrestlings with the Kantian epistemology through the years 1833-1835 while *Nature* was being committed to paper. It would have served to show that Kant's influence on Emerson was most profound during precisely the years when Mr. Vogel most minimizes it. The fact is that Emerson at the beginning of this period believed Carlyle who claimed that Kant had supplied the epistemological basis on which to demonstrate the identity of mind and matter, only to conclude (when he put the finishing touches to the little booklet) that Kantian transcendentalism, like every other form of idealism known to him at the time, was "merely a useful introductory hypothesis,"—that it could "account for nature by other principles than those of carpentry and chemistry," but that in the end it served merely

"to apprise us of the eternal distinction between the soul and the world."

Neither does Mr. Vogel make a good case for his conclusion that "Of the post Kantians the Concord writers had more in common with Schelling than with anyone else. Although it is not probable that they were to any great extent directly affected by Schelling, much of what they taught can be found in the writings of this philosopher" (p. 107). One asks for examples, instances, evidence, proof. Hegel's significance for Emerson is almost completely ignored although the journals and letters of the older Emerson (specifically after his making the acquaintance of Stallo's book in 1849) are full of extended passages in which he tries (never, to be sure, to his complete satisfaction) to equate Darwin with Hegel and both with his innate moral idealism—from which he never swerved, however often he changed the epistemological grounds on which he sought to make his religion philosophical and his philosophy religious.

Similarly, it would seem (as Professor Vogel observes) that although the Puritan in Emerson never could forgive the "bad morals" of Goethe, Emerson's repeated tributes to Goethe's trail-blazing natural theories (especially in the *Metamorphosis of Plants*) as having supplied him with fundamental insights into the botanical and zoological worlds may lead one to question Dr. Vogel's summary minimization of direct influence (pp. 103-104).

While I do not want to labor the point made earlier, that Part I might have been omitted in favor of more information regarding Germanic influences on the Transcendentalists themselves, there are notable omissions. To be sure, Orestes Brownson and Isaac Hecker were not for long of the inner circle and were written off completely when they embraced Catholicism; but Mr. Vogel's concluding his study with such lesser lights as J. S. Dwight and C. T. Brooks, leaves one to wonder why he did not include W. H. Channing and W. H. Furness, among the older Transcendentalists, and Samuel Osgood, C. A. Bartol, John Weiss, David A. Wasson, O. B. Frothingham, Samuel Longfellow, G. W. Cooke, Samuel Johnson, Moncure D. Conway, T. W. Higginson, James Elliot Cabot, among the younger generation.

These are typical examples of Mr. Vogel's occasional forays into the eternally debatable province of influence—an area in which Mr. Vogel is seldom as convincing as when he stays within the boundaries of his inquiry regarding the vogue of German literature and philosophy among the New England Transcendentalists.

We are nonetheless indebted to Professor Vogel for having supplied much fundamental information in this complicated area of comparative studies. Two of his appendices are especially noteworthy: (1) a list of "Books of German Interest in Emerson's Personal Library" and (2) a list of German books that Emerson borrowed from the Boston Athenaeum, the Boston Library Society, and the Harvard College library. A carefully executed author-subject index helps to make the whole an extremely valuable addition to our knowledge of German-American literary relations.

University of Wisconsin

HENRY A. POCHMANN

Howard C. Horsford, ed., *Journal of a Visit to Europe and the Levant, October 11, 1856-May 6, 1857, by Herman Melville* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955. xiv + 299 pp. \$5.00). WITHIN its modestly stated limits this is a model job of editing a private journal. Scholars now at last have an authentic and adequately annotated text of the most important of Melville's three short journals. The previous edition, edited by Raymond Weaver in 1935 as *Journal Up the Straits*, is out of print and filled with minor inaccuracies. Mr. Horsford has not only corrected the errors but has wisely attempted a *verbatim et literatim* transcription (as opposed to Weaver's policy of aiming at readability), since this is one of the very few holograph manuscripts in the Melville canon. More important is the greatly increased scope of the notes, which actually bulk larger than the text. The annotations clarifying cryptic references are fuller, and a new feature of prime importance is added: the relations of the journal to Melville's creative writings (the chief value it has for the student of literature) are indicated in great detail. The editorial apparatus also includes maps and chronology showing the itinerary of the journey, facsimile pages of the manuscript, and a full index. Thus the journal is made readily available for all conceivable uses.

The other duty of the editor, to provide an appropriate introduction, has been fulfilled with taste and intelligence. Mr. Horsford has limited himself to a fifty-page essay, carefully disciplined against exaggerating the journal's importance and against the temptation to use it as a springboard for a comprehensive revaluation of the author's mind. Two of the four sections of the Introduction are strictly factual, serving as further editorial aids. The first is a succinct as-



semblage of all the biographical data pertinent to this trip taken at a crucial period in Melville's career, with some new bits of information. The last is a description of the manuscript of the journal and an account of the editorial procedures employed in transcribing it, both of which are clear and intelligent. It is only in the two central sections of the Introduction, pp. 14-41, that Mr. Horsford permits himself to comment on the significance of the journal, out of the fullness of his special knowledge. In "The Man and his Thought" he brings together a considerable body of evidence proving Melville's tendency at this period toward despair, disillusion, and psychological insecurity. He makes out something of a case for his obsession with prisons and restricting enclosures, with high places and caves, with death and barrenness; but it does not appear whether this is supposed to throw light on his creative writings, or only on his inner biography. In "The Creator" the editor is more helpful. Here he gives an interesting though brief general account of how the journal of 1856 was levied on for *Clarel*, published twenty years later. He is equally clear in demonstrating how it was used to supply the staple of Melville's lectures, though this is of less literary interest. The effort to comb for evidence that he toyed with writing a sequel to *The Confidence Man* and a travel book drawn from his journey is not convincing. But this is a minor quibble.

All students of Melville will be grateful to Mr. Horsford for an authentic and fully annotated edition of the one reliable document on this last sad chapter in the abortive career of one of America's masters of prose fiction.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

William Van O'Connor, *The Tangled Fire of William Faulkner* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954. xv + 182 pp. Trade \$4.00, Text \$3.00). SINCE the Nobel Prize award, books on Faulkner have been appearing at the rate of two a year. In a previous review the present writer felt constrained to say that none of them so far had measured up to the significance or the complexity of their subject. The same must be said of this the sixth study (with reluctance, because of the superior monograph Mr. O'Connor published recently on another contemporary, Wallace Stevens). It is a tribute to the richness of Faulkner's achievement that everybody wants to have his say about him, though this prompts a tendency to

rush into print. But he is a difficult writer, who yields his full meaning only to long pondering and intensive analysis. For this reason the best Faulkner criticism continues to be found in the growing body of painstaking shorter studies (that can be culled from the flood of nearly fifty articles a year that overflows into the journals), supplemented by the choicest sections from the present volume, from Campbell and Foster's, Howe's, and the collection of critiques edited by Hoffman and Vickery. The really illuminating full-scale appraisal will probably not come until a critic of the first calibre devotes himself to such a scrutiny of this intricate shelf of fiction as is normally reserved for poetry.

Mr. O'Connor's study differs from its predecessors in essaying both biography and criticism. His two rivals in the former field, Miner and Coughlan, do not offer serious competition; nor does he himself consider this part of his task as primary. Indeed, the data he has collected seems almost as much of an embarrassment as an aid. Some of it he attempts to weave into an initial chapter identifying the Faulkner family with the fictive Sartoris clan; more of it, and with greater success, fills out the lean section on the apprentice years; the rest is either relegated to the notes as "not especially relevant" to the fictions or scattered through the text wherever it fits chronologically (though not usually functionally). Failure to amass sufficient facts for an adequate biography of Faulkner is certainly not the fault of Mr. O'Connor: it is simply an impossibility at the present stage. The subject himself is either evasive or cryptic, probably taking a justifiable pleasure in obfuscating those who try to pry into his private world. Self-appointed spokesmen like Phil Stone are voluble but their evidence must be weighed with caution; journalistic interviewers make too much out of too little. So the legend grows, begotten by gossip upon a blank wall. It would have been helpful if Mr. O'Connor had taken a more critical attitude toward the data he does present, trying to sort out fact from rumor more rigorously. For many of the readers to whom this volume is directed may fail to discriminate between the reliability of gossip about Faulkner's binges in Hollywood and information like publisher's data on the number of copies of his novels printed, or they may take too literally such statements as the one attributed to the novelist that he had never worried about problems of technique. We may have to wait many years for an authentic biography, even more for a really useful one. Much of the data here offered can be accepted only tentatively; virtually none of it helps us to

understand the novels. It was not possible to integrate it with the critical aspect of this study, as the author readily confesses; further, it may have led him into the chronological arrangement of his chapters, which is not necessarily the best way to study Faulkner.

Perhaps the fairest way to treat this as a critical study is to take a cue from the last words in the caption above, that a textbook edition is available at a reduced book. There are many indications that the chief audience aimed at is the college student and the general reader, who are largely unacquainted with Faulkner's great range of fictions. If such is its modest intention, this book will serve as a competent and helpful introduction. The whole shelf of novels and stories is surveyed, and the treatment is orderly, clear, and intelligent. First there is a plot summary followed by a running commentary that takes advantage of much of the best previous criticism, blended with the author's own opinions and reactions. Most of this is sound, and there are a number of new insights that are perceptive. As an introduction to Faulkner, there is only one question that need be raised: does it communicate an enthusiasm that will send the readers to the fictions themselves?

For the serious student of Faulkner this volume is not so useful. The best of it has previously been published in articles, and now assembled there is disappointingly little that is both original in approach and illuminating as criticism. The forgetful may find some help in the indication of interrelations among the fictions and in the literal and logical synopses which unravel the complications of the major novels (like the notes one might take, rather sheepishly, to aid him in following the tortuous movement of *Absalom, Absalom!*, then quickly discard as being actually something of a falsification). But, however tentative the new techniques for criticizing fiction may be, it is now pretty generally agreed that the plot summary does not provide a fruitful approach. The exploratory analysis of structure, symbol, and language in relation to theme, and all these integrated with character, action, and description—this method has proved more rewarding than the frontal attack, but it takes more intensive study and more space than Mr. O'Connor allows himself. In his two best explications he does make some use of this method, combined with fresh and provocative insights. There is considerable originality in his diagnosis of the central theme of *Light in August* as "the terrible excesses of the Calvinist spirit." This gives him a key to one of the novel's real meanings, but he does not explore the area thus unlocked as far as one could wish. Most of the space is given to listing the subject matter

that fits with this theme, rather than showing how this idea "works" in the text. Better still is his critique of *The Bear*, analyzing with skill the complicated interrelations of the two versions of this great novelette and the earlier story "Lion." This intensive study opens a way to the solution of some of the most baffling areas of Faulkner's fiction (a solution not fully pursued, however): the ritual of the hunt, the "primitive" values of the wilderness, the human problems plaguing the races of mankind in their interactions.

But these are the only two chapters that stir the devoted student of Faulkner. At the other pole there are only two that strike the present reviewer as serious misinterpretations, those on *The Unvanquished* and *Intruder in the Dust*. The answer is not far to seek. The preface says the book was motivated by a disagreement with those critics who find the key to Faulkner in his "Legend of the South." Scattered comments throughout the book (pp. 14, 34-5, 100-2, 111-3, 137-42) indicate that even the idea of an ordered society and an aristocratic spirit, whether in the New South or the Old, in fact or in fiction, is distasteful to the author. So two of Faulkner's most important affirmations—widely neglected or misunderstood by many others besides Mr. O'Connor—are dismissed as romantic or sentimental. But this mixing of non-literary values does not lead him into as grave errors as it did Irving Howe. On the whole, *The Tangled Fire of William Faulkner* should prove a useful introduction for the novice, with many small boons and two valuable contributions for the continuing education of the dedicated.

The specialist owes one more debt to Mr. O'Connor for making available Faulkner's earliest prose—eleven short pieces buried in the files of the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* since their first printing in February-March 1925—as a by-product of his researches for the above volume. In his introduction, drawn from the appropriate chapter of his study "The Period of Apprenticeship," he sifts this juvenilia for all possible leads into the later Faulkner: a sketch dealing with an idiot, another showing a victimized negro, a sharp eye for eccentrics, a hint of acquaintance with Vorticist theories that may have influenced his later stylistic devices. But these early journalistic efforts are thin and amateurish, chiefly interesting as further evidence of the astonishingly late and sudden maturing of Faulkner as a writer. He was twenty-eight years old at the time of writing them (a year before his first novel, a year after his first volume of poems); yet only four years later the great leap was made from these trivial performances to

that brilliant stroke of his genius, *The Sound and the Fury*. We will have to know a great deal more than we do now to bridge that gap, if ever. Meantime, it is valuable to have one more document in the record (William Faulkner, *Mirrors of Chartres Street*, Minneapolis: Faulkner Studies, 1953, 93 pp., \$3.25)

*The Johns Hopkins University*

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

**Hermann Flasdieck, "Pall Mall," *Beiträge zur Etymologie und Quantitätstheorie* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1954. Anglia, 72, ii-iii, pp. 129-383).** OSTENSIBLY concerned merely with the origin and history of the London street name *Pall Mall*—which, even including, as it does, recent developments like the adoption of the term as the brand name of a popular cigarette, could be adequately treated in a few pages—this is an elaborate and careful study of all manner of semantic and phonological problems arising in one connection or other with the development of *pall*, *mall*, and many other related and unrelated words. (Some 1200 are included in the index). In view of the cryptic title, the best service a reviewer can perform is to try to suggest something of the actual scope of Professor Flasdieck's work.

Part I (pp. 131-48) treats briefly the name *Pall Mall*, including its different pronunciations in England and America. Part II (pp. 148-72) deals with the etymology of *pall* and related terms, which Flasdieck traces to ME *pellēn* and *pēlen*, derived ultimately from Latin *pellere* but directly borrowed from Old French. Part IV (pp. 313-60) is similarly concerned with the etymology of *mall* and related terms, which he derives from OE *\*mell(e)*, explained as a pre-English, continental borrowing of Latin *malleus*. I have not attempted to check the accuracy or plausibility of his many etymological conjectures and conclusions.

The major part of the study, and the one of most consequence certainly, is Part III (pp. 172-313), which is concerned with the vowel quantity problem immediately posed by *pellēn* and *pēlen* but as pursued by Flasdieck becomes a comprehensive treatment of vowel and consonant quantity in ME and in O Fr. as well. His very interesting and, I think, sound assumption is that much can be learned about O Fr. quantity from ME words borrowed from French. His conclusions about O Fr. quantity are briefly summarized pp. 279-80 and 305-7 and will be discussed further in his forthcoming study "Urfrauz."

und urengl. Vokalismus im Spiegel der Britannia romana" in *Zs. für rom. Philologie*. Of most interest to students of ME phonology are the following conclusions: (1) In stressed position O Fr. vowels were long or short depending on whether the syllable was open or closed. This long-short distinction was still maintained at the time of ME borrowing from French and is reflected in these borrowings. The vowel quantity in pairs like *pēlen* — *pellēn* or *pass* — *pāce* cannot therefore be ascribed to varying or indistinct vowel quantity in O Fr. (2) In closed syllables O Fr. vowels were long before *r* + consonant, and it is this which accounts for the long vowel in ME words like *court*. This is to say, Flasdieck rejects the generally accepted notion, though I think there is still much to be said for it, that the long vowel here is due to weak articulation of *r*. (3) In syllables not bearing main stress O Fr. vowels were short but with shifted stress after being borrowed in ME were either lengthened (e.g. *māson*) or stayed short (e.g. *city*, *baron*). In the latter instance, to conform with ME quantity types, the consonant might be geminated (e.g. *robben*), which, though better expressed, is essentially the same conclusion as mine (*Anglia* LXIII, 73-87). Flasdieck disagrees sharply with me about the cause of the short vowel. Perhaps he is right about this, though I believe the evidence, historical and experimental, indicates light stress on the following syllable, which may have been an accompanying feature, however, rather than, as I maintained, the cause of the preceding short vowel. Flasdieck, it seems to me, fails to appreciate the significance of Davis's and my experimental work (*The Effect of Stress Upon Quantity in Dissyllables*, 1939), regarding it apparently as little more than an elaboration of Meyer's *Englische Lautdauer* though in fact the two studies are quite different.

What seems to me a serious flaw in Part III is that the quantity changes in Old and Middle English are too simply conceived (pp. 177-8). In a study he had not seen (*Studies in Philology* XLV, 1-20) I discussed two of these changes, and the conclusions I arrived at must be taken into account in any attempt to push on to a better understanding — which heaven knows we need — of vowel and consonant quantity in earlier English. One of the most vexing problems here is the apparently odd behavior of French loan words, and the few scholars who have seriously tried to grapple with the problem cannot fail to be impressed with the thoroughness of Flasdieck's work.

University of North Carolina

NORMAN E. ELIASON



Ernest Hœpffner, *Les Troubadours dans leur vie et dans leurs œuvres* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1955. 224 pp. 250 fr.). THIS is a convenient and unpretentious little book written by a specialist for non-specialists that admirably serves to give a valid understanding of its subject. Eclectic, it avoids taking an arbitrary stand on certain controversial problems, while at the same time approaching them in a sane and judicial fashion. After a helpful general introduction, it divides the Provençal lyric into periods, each one of which is represented by the more significant troubadours of the time. The works of some fifteen poets are analyzed in detail with copious citations and translations.

The poets range from those of the first and second generations—Guillaume d'Aquitaine, Jaufré Rudel, Marcabru—through those of the transition and golden age, to the troubadours of the last sad stages of the decline. The analyses not only characterize the lyrics of the individual troubadours, but indicate their varying attitudes toward their art, the different types of poetry cultivated by them and the material conditions of their professional lives. Hœpffner's critical judgments are conservatively sound, and the estimates of the poets' own contemporaries are often contrasted to good purpose with those of posterity. The *vidas* are employed with proper scepticism and the hopeless task of trying to identify the poets' loves is for the most part abandoned. Bibliographical material is restricted to a relatively few general volumes and to the naming in each instance of the best available edition for the poet under consideration.

In short, for a *vue d'ensemble* and for an excellent introduction to a more detailed study of the troubadours this small volume can be read with pleasure and used with confidence.

Baltimore

GRACE FRANK

Nan Cooke Carpenter, *Rabelais and Music*. (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1954. xiii + 149 pp.). LE goût de la musique était fort répandu au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, et les allusions que Rabelais a faites à la musique, dans son oeuvre littéraire, sont très importantes. Miss Carpenter étudie successivement les allusions qui se rapportent aux instruments de musique, à la chanson, à la musique liturgique, aux "*musical ideas*;" et elle conclut par un chapitre sur Rabelais et la musique. Elle a utilisé ce qu'a dit L. Sainéan sur les

instruments de musique, sur la notation musicale, sur la musique religieuse, la musique profane, airs et danses (*La langue de Rabelais*, I, 198-208), sur les chansons (*ibid.*, I, 262-277), sur les métaphores musicales (*ibid.*, II, 276-277); mais on voit, chez Sainéan, un certain désordre, des répétitions et des erreurs. Le travail le plus moderne sur le sujet qui nous occupe est la communication du savant musicologue, Ch. van den Borren, à l'Académie Royale de Belgique, en 1942. Miss Carpenter corrige, complète, rassemble ce qu'ont dit ses prédécesseurs.

Je ferai quelques remarques à propos des chansons. Miss Carpenter parle de la chanson "usually in one of the literary forms fixes. . . ." J'aurais aimé une recherche sur une distinction à faire entre les chansons et les genres à forme fixe. Mes *Poèmes de transition*, et mes *Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche* contiennent des pièces et des renseignements qui auraient pu intéresser Miss Carpenter.

Dans son chapitre sur les "musical ideas," Miss Carpenter étudie les allusions métaphoriques au système de Guido d'Arezzo. Comme j'avais publié, en avril 1947, dans *Speculum*, une note sur les métaphores de ce genre faites par Machaut et par Rabelais, je me permettrai de dire que je ne suis pas tout à fait de l'avis de Miss Carpenter, sur l'interprétation d'un passage du roman rabelaisien: dans un chapitre de *Pantagruel*, Panurge dit à Anarche: "chante plus hault, en g-sol-ré-ut." Miss Carpenter voit bien, comme moi, qu'il s'agit de chanter une note plus élevée que celle qu'emploie Anarche. La difficulté est que, dans le système de Guido, il y a deux notes qui sont désignées par le terme composé g-sol-ré-ut. On peut les distinguer, en disant que l'une est d'en-bas; l'autre, d'en haut. Miss Carpenter prétend que Panurge ordonne à Anarche "growling in the lowest range of the scale, to pitch his voice in the middle register." Sur le diagramme qu'elle a tracé, elle a marqué d'une flèche le "g-sol-ré-ut" d'en bas; et c'est, apparemment, la note qu'elle veut indiquer comme étant celle à laquelle Anarche doit élever la voix. Mais il me semble que c'est la note d'en haut dont il faut parler, car c'est là une des difficultés traditionnelles que rencontraient les chantres, quand il leur fallait monter jusqu'aux notes élevées comme "c-sol-fa."

Mais, jusque là, ce ne sont, en somme, que des détails sur lesquels nous faisons des réserves. Ce qui nous paraît plus aventuré, ce sont les opinions de Miss Carpenter sur le *Cinquième Livre*. Nous ne pouvons pas admettre que ce livre soit tout entier, ni même en grande partie, l'oeuvre de Rabelais. On sait, d'ailleurs, toutes les controverses

qui se sont élevées sur la question de l'authenticité de cette dernière partie du roman. Nous ne rouvrirons pas le débat.

Mais, depuis le début de ce compte rendu, une question se pose, avec insistance: pourquoi un livre sur Rabelais et la musique est-il publié dans une collection consacrée à la littérature comparée?

C'est que Miss Carpenter étudie, dans son chapitre sur les "musical ideas," l'humanisme et le néo-platonisme de Rabelais. Elle revient là-dessus, dans le chapitre intitulé "Rabelais and Music," avec une discussion sur l'Androgyne, sur "the Renaissance uomo universale," et nous voyons que ces deux derniers chapitres de Miss Carpenter, qui sont parmi les plus longs et qui sont aussi les plus savants et les plus originaux de son livre, soulèvent les objections, les doutes, et ne peuvent s'accepter sans résistance. Miss Carpenter est prête à souscrire aux idées exprimées par Miss Yates dans son livre *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century*. Dans l'ensemble, rien pourtant, ne nous paraît plus faux que de parler de la conception de l'homme universel qui se serait manifestée à la "Renaissance." Le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle français est non seulement relié étroitement au Moyen Age; mais, surtout, c'est au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle qu'on assiste à la spécialisation de la culture, à la séparation des arts, à la division du travail, à la formation de classes sociales de plus en plus antipathiques les unes aux autres. L'humanisme qui, évidemment, joue un grand rôle à ce moment favorise une culture aristocratique ou plutôt plutocratique et oligarchique à laquelle les masses populaires deviennent de plus en plus étrangères. Rabelais est encore près du peuple, et les origines de son roman sont populaires. Ancien moine, médecin, Rabelais a laissé dans son oeuvre des marques de son premier état et de sa profession: il a dû apprendre la musique et les allusions musicales sont nombreuses; les allusions à la médecine sont plus nombreuses encore. Et qu'était-ce au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, qu'être médecin? C'était, d'abord, être un érudit, un philologue, un lettré. Le roman rabelaisien exalte la science, le bon sens, la valeur des connaissances concrètes et pratiques. Si l'on peut trouver, dans son roman, des traces de l'influence de Ficin, c'est que Rabelais étale avec complaisance tout un amas de connaissances, et d'allusions érudites; si l'on signale sa dette à l'égard de Francesco Colonna, c'est pour montrer la variété de ses sources et l'étendue de sa culture; mais, si l'on veut connaître ses idées pédagogiques, il faut remarquer que les langues dont Gargantua recommande l'étude à son fils sont le grec, le latin, l'hébreu et l'arabe. Pourquoi ces langues? Parce qu'elles sont utiles pour la connaissance—et la discussion—de la Bible; parce qu'elles

permettent de comprendre les livres de médecine des anciens. Rabelais est plein d'admiration pour les progrès de la médecine, au début du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, comme pour la connaissance plus approfondie qu'on a, à cette époque, du droit romain. Voilà les conquêtes qu'il célèbre; voilà le sens social et utilitaire qu'il donne à son roman. Il ne s'appesantit pas sur les conceptions quintessenciées qui faisaient les délices des milieux mondains où l'influence ficinienne s'est fait sentir, en Italie comme en France. Il est difficile de dire que Rabelais a, dans son roman, exprimé des idées philosophiques, ou, plutôt, qu'il a adhéré à un système; mais il apparaît bien plus près des matérialistes que des idéalistes. M. Henri Dontenville a fort justement remarqué, dans son excellent livre, *Rabelais vu de la Devinière*, qu' "un fait est patent: l'oeuvre de Maître François a toujours été le bréviaire des incrédules." C'est pour cela que nous avons protesté contre le livre de Miss Yates; c'est pour cela que nous faisons des réserves sur celui de Miss Carpenter. Le néo-platonisme est, aujourd'hui, à la mode, à une des époques les plus matérialistes du monde, et les plus barbares. Il y a là un contraste saisissant. Or, justement, c'est aux hommes qu'étouffe l'hypocrisie ambiante que l'oeuvre de Rabelais apporte du réconfort et de la joie. Voilà, pour nous, le "message" de Rabelais. Remercions Miss Carpenter de nous avoir donné un savant livre qui soulève des problèmes et stimule la pensée.

Harvard University

MARCEL FRANÇON

Fred P. Ellison, *Brazil's New Novel, Four Northeastern Masters: José Lins do Rego, Jorge Amado, Graciliano Ramos, Rachel de Queiroz*. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1954. xvi + 191 pp. \$3.75). ELLISON has written a detailed, careful introduction to the sociological novel of Northeastern Brazil. It takes its place beside David M. Driver's monograph on the Indianist literature of Brazil and works on Spanish-American fiction, notably Ernest Moore's about the Novel of the Mexican Revolution. Ellison's is the first book-length treatment of a subject that has attracted a good many students here and in Brazil; many an M. A. thesis has been written about it, one of the most recent being Edmund da Silveira's *Social and Literary Values in José Lins do Rego's Sugar Cane Cycle* (University of Washington, 1953). Surprisingly few of these evaluations appeared in print: E. E. Stowell's on Jorge Amado in 1945 (*Revista Iberoamericana*) and Franklin M. Thompson's on

*Fogo Morto*, one of Lins do Rego's novels, in 1950 (*Modern Language Journal*).

The Novel of the Northeast can already be viewed with some detachment since it flourished between 1930 and 1940, forming with the *modernista* poetry of the twenties and thirties the unmistakably Brazilian literature of our century. Its power derives from its vision of the three tragic struggles that torment the Northeastern Bulge. One is man's resistance or surrender to an evil destiny, in the shape of the natural catastrophes, mainly periodical droughts, poverty, malnutrition, disease, fanaticism, violence, corruption and degradation which attend human existence in the Brazilian tropics. The second is the antagonism between two populations, the products of two "Northeasters," the "pure," lean backlands versus the "corrupt," lush coastal strip. The third is the death struggle of the traditional sugar economy which had put its stamp on Northeastern life ever since the arrival of the Portuguese on the South-American coast. Modern impatience with social imperfections, which manifested itself everywhere in this century through a literature of social protest, combined in Brazil, as in the rest of the Americas with nationalist and regionalist aspirations. Specifically American themes and types, first introduced a century ago by the Romantics, reappeared now in a more realistic and less picturesque light. In quick succession we saw arise the *indigenista* novel of the Andes countries, the novel of the Mexican Revolution of 1910, the Gaucho novel with its "blood and soil" implications, the novel of the countryfolk of Venezuela and Colombia, the novel of the Old South in North America. Like the last named, the Brazilian novel of the Northeast was fed by another stream, a cultural tradition in the process of disintegration. If one adds to this the little known wealth of folkloric matter and the variety of human types in city and countryside resulting from contacts between Amerindian, African and European groups one can see the infinite potentialities of the Brazilian fiction. Ellison points out this vitality in his conclusions. As if to prove it, 1953 witnessed a new rash of works on the historical theme of Northeastern banditry, which culminated in *Cangaceiros* ("Bandits"), Lins do Rego's latest novel, and *Lampião*, a play by Rachel de Queiroz, taking its name from a notorious bandit of the twenties and thirties. Immediately following, Northeastern authors began to publish autobiographies: Graciliano Ramos' posthumous *Memórias do Cárcere* ("Memories of Jail," 4 vols., 1954) were followed by the poet Manuel Bandeira's *Itinerário*

de *Pasárgada* and Gilberto Amado's *História da minha Infância* ("The Story of my Childhood"). Jorge Amado's new novel in three volumes, *Subterrâneos da Liberdade* ("Caves of Liberty," 1954) may likewise be suspected to have an autobiographical slant. The folklore of the region has at the same time been interpreted anew by Luís da Câmara Cascudo, who annotated a new edition of Sylvio Romero's pioneer work. All these publications, too recent to be included in Ellison's study, as well as the poetry and shorter fiction of the region, belong to the full-length portrait of a literature molded, as Ellison points out in his introductory chapter, by the influence of one man in particular, the sociologist Gilberto Freyre Pernambuco.

The present study possesses the qualities and defects inherent in academic dissertations. It is based, not on personal insight or acquaintance, but on readings—readings of texts and even more readings of critical literature. Fortunately Ellison was a reader with good judgment. The focus is brought to bear on a segment, which was at first more adequately labeled as "the plantation novel of Brazil's Northeast." Its promotion to "Brazil's New Novel" and to a gallery of four "masters" should not mislead anyone into imagining that all is masterly in the works of the four novelists (I would call only Ramos a master unreservedly), or that no new novels of value have appeared in the rest of Brazil. While the Northeastern segment is the most striking, it does not claim to represent the whole country. Ellison follows academic tradition in combining biography with good summaries of the novels. He has his facts well in hand and avoids gossip-mongering or guesswork. He wisely limits himself to the discussion of the twenty-nine novels of four major writers—feminist Rachel de Queiroz; Lins do Rego, compassionate toward the high and the lowly alike; bitter, introspective Graciliano Ramos; and demagogic, folksy and crude Jorge Amado. He touches lightly on questions of form and style, making an exception in the case of Lins do Rego. He situates his novelists within Brazilian history but pays little attention to the wider history of literatures which would relate them with movements in Europe, Spanish-America or North America. Passing references to forerunners—Euclides da Cunha, Domingos Olympio etc.—show that Ellison is aware of the roots of the Northeastern novel, but they do not add up to a history. Devoting separate chapters to each of the four writers results in retracing a literary development in four parallels. And since these are living writers who still produce, with one exception (Ramos), he condemns himself to incompleteness.



These are limitations; they are not serious flaws. Well written, Ellison's book is sure to stimulate fresh interest in a fascinating region which had attracted only two eccentrics among Anglo-American writers so far, Cunningham-Graham and Samuel Putnam. Judging from the passages which Ellison offers in translation, he would be an ideal person to undertake versions of Lins do Rego and Rachel de Queiroz, none of whose works are available in English. His research on the novel should encourage him to write the studies of Northeastern tales, dramas, memories, essays, folklore and sociology which would complete his undertaking.

Pennsylvania State University

G. MOSER

David Lee Clark, ed., *Shelley's Prose, or the Trumpet of a Prophecy* (Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1954. 385 pp. \$8.50). PROFESSOR Clark has put together in one volume all of Shelley's known prose compositions exclusive of his novels and correspondence. For this we are sincerely grateful, since we need no longer suffer the inconvenience and confusion of supplementing the incomplete Julian edition. In view of the present disordered state of Shelley bibliography, almost any effort to bring the material together is helpful.

But even our gratitude cannot prevent us from questioning Clark's editorial and critical standards. The edition is clearly not intended for the research scholar, for if it were it would necessarily include all the variant readings in the manuscripts; and it is unlikely that the scholar will feel the need of the introductory analysis of Shelley's thought. Nor will the scholar appreciate the well-meaning efforts to transform Shelley's prose into apocalyptic utterances by such glosses on *A Defense of Poetry* as "How profound is this statement. Here is in a nutshell the fundamental trouble with the world today"; "Again Shelley penetrates to the heart of the world's unrest"; "Shelley's judgment has stood the test of time."

There is every indication that this expensive volume is intended for what Clark calls "the student," that is, the person making his first intensive study of Shelley and for the intelligent non-professional reader. But it is very difficult to imagine what use "the student" is to make of the volume. Surely Shelley's prose can be only ancillary to his poetry and has rather little worth in its own right. Had Shelley never written some major poems, his prose, most of which is

fragmentary and tentative, would—rightly—be almost wholly neglected. Except for his *Defense* and perhaps the brief essays on Life and on Love and what used to be called *Speculations on Metaphysics and Morals*, Shelley's papers seldom rise intellectually much above the level of the speculative periodical essays of the age. And certainly they are not art in any sense of that word. Yet we are asked here to give an independent worth to the prose: it is, we are told, "the trumpet of a prophecy heard in the soul-animating strains of his poetry." I suggest that, with a few exceptions, it is negligible in itself, and at best, like his letters, can perhaps assist us in our efforts to grasp his poetry more fully. Who would care about *The Assassins* or the notes to *Queen Mab* if they had been written by Hogg?

This confusion of values leads the editor into a curious and disturbing conception of the relation of prose to poetic statement. "The editor is convinced," he writes, "that one who would understand Shelley's poetry must study his prose essays, preferably *before* he reads the poetry. The varied and complex ideas of the poetry are the same ideas encountered in the prose, but more difficult to understand because they have been translated into highly figurative language and colorful imagery." Now, undoubtedly an intelligent reading of Shelley's poetry requires the adoption of a very special perspective, but the idea of being required to engage in an intellectual ritual before being allowed the esthetic experience (with what is not yet known to be an esthetic object) does not suggest the autonomy of art. And to ask the "student" first to read 350 footnote-laden pages of Shelley's not especially attractive prose is probably to destroy whatever small desire he had to get to the poetry. One would rather hope, instead, that the reading of the poetry would drive one to the prose for assistance in reclaiming as much as possible of the poetry. But much more disturbing is the suggestion that the poetry is the prose idea decorated by figures and imagery—prose that has gone to the beauty shop and become sophisticated. When Shelley chose to express himself in poetry rather than in prose, one would like to assume that he did so because he had something to say that he could not say in prose, something that, in its essence, is wholly different from anything he said in prose because it required for its expression all those shaping and qualifying powers that are inherent in the poetic form alone. Or, if Clark is right in his description, then Shelley never wrote poetry, but only bare essays and ornamented ones. Yet, the editor is quite insistent: "the student will find in the beautiful imagery of

[Shelley's] poetry the same ideas; Shelley has merely changed the vehicle of expression from a matter-of-fact prose to that of highly figurative poetry." In his effort to dignify the prose he has seriously understated the nature and worth of the poetry, which alone justifies our attention to Shelley. If Shelley's poetry is ever again to become esthetically relevant, it must be through a more meaningful esthetics than Clark brings to his task.

Most of the editor's research has been devoted to his extensive and helpful headnotes and footnotes which point out similarities between passages in Shelley and others in Spinoza, Hume, Berkeley, Stewart, Reid, etc. Suggestive though these parallels are, they tend to define Shelley's thought as entirely derivative and eclectic. If one trusts the editor's analysis, Shelley's essays are only a stew of borrowed thoughts: *A Treatise on Morals*, for example, is, in its metaphysics, "definitely Lockean, with enough of Hume's scepticism to give the work soundness," and its "principles of morals come directly from Hume and Adam Smith." Or the *Essay on Life* is an attempt "to reconcile Berkeleian idealism with the scepticism of Hume, with little success." The Berkeleian and Humean factors are of course easily seen, but merely to catalogue these factors is to neglect the possibility that Shelley was shaping them into a consistent concept that is neither Berkeley's nor Hume's, but Shelley's. At least, I believe the essay is quite successful in establishing and maintaining its own distinctive principles. It is necessary, of course, to see Shelley's ideas in their historical setting, but it is also necessary to face the fact that Shelley at least attempted to synthesize his ideas into a peculiarly Shelleyan philosophy which cannot be resolved merely into a collection of snippets from other thinkers. Clark borders on this truth when at one point he observes that "the words *atheist*, *Platonist*, *materialist*, or *immaterialist* cannot, without considerable discrimination . . . be at any time applied to Shelley"; but he does not thereafter make use of this excellent observation.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

EARL R. WASSERMAN

**Fernand Vial, *Voltaire, sa vie et son œuvre* (Paris: Marcel Didier, 1953. 678 pp.).** ONE is moved to admire the courage and industry of a man who undertakes a one-volume work bearing this title. Having read and digested a tremendous mass of primary and secondary material, having made an objective selection of the most significant

facts, texts, and opinions found in this material, having condensed these in the most informative and readable manner possible, he is then exposed to the critical judgements of that legion of readers who consider themselves Voltaire "experts."

Mr. Vial, one feels, has met these difficulties with a remarkable degree of success. In 115 pages, he presents the reader with a tightly constructed summary of Voltaire's life and talents in which no fault is glossed over, and no praiseworthy feature undervalued. Each section of the 536 pages devoted to the works contains a complete text or selection with notes and an introduction based upon authoritative studies. Thus, the section entitled "Voltaire auteur dramatique" contains a rapid review of Voltaire's ideas and techniques bearing on tragedy and the mixed genres, an outline of his production of tragedies (the comedies are not mentioned), and the text of *Mérope* with notes and a three-page introduction. In the next section, *La Henriade* is described as a well organized failure remarkable only for some portraits and descriptions of which samples are given. Voltaire's abilities as an historian, however, are praised in a comparatively long introduction in which only his prejudice against the Middle Ages is deprecated. The thirteen selected chapters of the *Siècle de Louis XIV* which follow constitute one of the longest sections of the book.

Considerable space is also given to an exposition of Voltaire's notions on metaphysics, morality, and civics, his techniques of propaganda, and his philosophical works. Twenty-four *Lettres philosophiques* with notes apparently based on Lanson's edition are given as examples of Voltaire's philosophical method. His techniques as a writer of prose fiction and his *contes philosophiques* are described next in a more compressed form but with a greater luxuriance of approbation, and accompanied by the text of *Zadig* taken from the edition of Kehl with notes evidently based on Ascoli's edition.

The last two sections of the book are concerned with Voltaire as a lyric and satiric poet, and as a writer of letters. His ability as a wielder of words is shown to be the basis of his success as a satirist, while his lack of true *sensibilité* accounts for the poor quality of his lyrics. The multiple charms and interest of his correspondence are also well brought out. As usual, appropriate textual selections and helpful notes accompany the general discussion.

It is not impossible, of course, to find fault with Mr. Vial's wide ranging work. The choice of texts will, of necessity, disappoint many students of Voltaire who will look in vain for their favorite passages.

One might argue, for example, that the chosen sections of the *Lettres philosophiques* do not represent the most effective and significant of Voltaire's philosophical writings because of their comparatively early date of composition, their comparative conservatism, and the curious omission of the commentary on Pascal. On a less subjective level, it might be charged that the author has referred in his notes and in his short bibliography to too few recent publications, although Mr. Vial has undoubtedly reasoned, with justification, that for a general discussion of Voltaire, the older books are still the best, and that for illustrative citations, it is better to use Voltaire's own words than the opinions of recent critics. On a still more objective level, one finds it difficult to agree with some of Mr. Vial's statements: e.g., that the "Fable" personified in the beginning of *La Henriade* is mythology, that Dante was a Ghibelline (p. 427), that the Jaucourt of the *Encyclopédie* was a marquis (p. 78), that the author of the discussion of *Mérope* cited on page 145 is Faguet, or that Voltaire first began writing *contes* at the age of fifty-five (p. 497). Yet, in spite of a few minor errors and misprints, Mr. Vial's book, because of its scope, concision, general objectivity, readability, and numerous textual selections, seems to be one of the most useful single books on Voltaire for the student of French literature.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

CLIFTON CHERPACK







*Back Volumes*  
*of*  
**MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES**

*Available at a special reduced price*

Volumes 24 through 64, covering the years 1909 through 1949, are available at a special price of 25 cents per issue, \$2.00 per volume. The regular price is \$8.00 per volume. Not all volumes are complete, as some numbers have gone out of print. The sale ends on April 15, 1956.

---

❖ JAMES C. McLAREN ❖  
**THE THEATRE OF ANDRÉ GIDE**  
*Evolution of a Moral Philosopher*

This first complete study of Gide's theatre considers his plays and dialogues as psychological documents which reveal more accurately than any other genre the succeeding phases of his development as moral philosopher and esthetician.

The dramatic form is naturally suited to an externalization of Gide's moral conflict, and the protagonists of his theatre represent the participants in a constantly changing inner dialogue of moral extremes.

1953

127 pages

\$3.00



*The Johns Hopkins Press*

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

Many teachers of French will be glad to know that by arrangement with the Librairie Hachette in Paris, D. C. Heath and Company is now sole educational distributor in the United States of the attractive and widely known

## CLASSIQUES ILLUSTRÉS VAUBOURDOLLE

You can obtain your copies of the various titles quickly and conveniently from our stock. Twenty-nine titles are now available, of which nine are from twentieth century authors. Edited by French scholars with introductions, footnotes, bibliographies, and exercises—all in French.

*Each book, \$ .40*



### D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: Englewood, N. J.  
Atlanta 3

Chicago 16

San Francisco 5

Dallas 1

Home Office: Boston 16

## THE HARMONIOUS VISION

by DON CAMERON ALLEN

One of the central poetic topics that engaged the imagination of John Milton was that of the vision given to man when he had put his own inner music in harmony with that of God. In *THE HARMONIOUS VISION* this theme becomes an important means of explicating some of Milton's poetry and of understanding his artistic intent.

As Allen leads the reader through Milton's poetry, he shows the twin development of Milton as a poet, and of the idea of the "harmonious vision" in the poetry itself.

In the Fall, the harmonious vision is lost, but it can be won again. Towards its recapture, Milton, true son of Eve, expended the full powers of his poetic life.

The book comprises six essays, written in a scholarly yet engaging style. In this new reading of the great poet, Don Cameron Allen has produced a book which the publishers believe will be of utmost importance to Miltonists, and all serious students of poetry.

146 pages

Index

\$3.00



*The Johns Hopkins Press*

HOMWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND